THE ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

THIRD SERIES—VOL. VIII.—(XXVIII).—FEBRUARY, 1903.—NO. 2.

THE NAME OF THE CHURCH.

THERE are two sufficient reasons for discussing at present the name of the Church. The first is that many Catholics of influence do not realize the importance of a "form of sound words" in speaking of the Church. The whole power of the State is at the service of a commercial company in protecting its right to the exclusive use of its own name; but the Church has no such protection. On the contrary, State influence in English-speaking countries acts powerfully in the direction of imposing on the Church a name which the Church has authoritatively rejected. And this is not a matter that Catholics can afford to ignore. The name of the Church is of vital importance. It is not possible that a trivial matter could elicit one of the warmest debates that took place in the Vatican Council, and the name of the Church was the subject of such a debate. The Bishops insisted that nothing should be done to obscure our exclusive claim to this name—*The Catholic Church.* For this reason they refused to allow the Church to be called the *Roman Catholic Church.* One of the arguments used by them may be thus stated:

In the biography of Ambrose de Lisle we are told that the seed of his subsequent conversion was sown in his boyhood when reciting those words of the Apostles' Creed: "I believe in the Holy Ghost, the holy Catholic Church." The thoughts of thousands or even millions of Protestant children are directed to the Catholic Church by those words of the Creed. The interest which they manifest in the Catholic Church in after years very often

dates from their first acquaintance with the Creed. The more strictly we keep to the original name of the Church in our every-day speaking and writing, the more forcibly will the Apostles' Creed draw Protestants back to the Church. The force of this attraction is so great that in Catholic countries, where the expression "Roman Catholic Church" is never heard in daily life, Protestant missionaries are often forced to ignore the Apostles' Creed altogether. How can they teach their people to believe in the holy Catholic Church when the language of daily life about them identifies the Church of the Apostles' Creed with the Church in communion with the Pope? In English-speaking countries the difficulty is evaded by their habit of calling the Church the Roman Catholic Church, and Catholics who imitate them in this habit unconsciously help to turn the thoughts of Protestants away from the Church.

This is one of several reasons which induced the Vatican Council to reject "Roman Catholic" in discussing the form of words to be used. It is as far as possible from being a matter of small importance.

The second reason for discussing the name of the Church is that in English-speaking countries at least there is in fact a good deal of confusion in our practice, if not in our minds. The Reformation succeeded in forcing upon us the use of two words. In his Anglican days Newman was able thus to retort upon Catholics:

"If Romanists among us still taunt us with our present loss of the name Catholic, as far as the world's witness goes, then we take leave to remind them that if we have let slip 'Catholic,' at least we have kept 'Church,' which in this country they have not; and thus we have a popular witness in our favor as well as they. It is a common reproach of theirs against us, that if we were to take St. Cyril's test, and ask in the street for the 'Catholic' place of worship, no one would dream of directing us to any but theirs. Now it has been retorted, truly and happily, that in like manner if they ask for the 'Church,' they will be directed to none other than ours. We go to *church*, and they to *chapel*."

Seventy-five years ago this was a good controversial retort. They had succeeded in forcing upon our forefathers the humble word *chapel*. Nowadays the retort would have neither point nor

meaning, because we have vindicated our right to the use of the word "church," and we have regained that right by force of our own daily practice in using correctly the word "church." The other word forced into daily use by the Reformation is the word "Roman," and in this case there is still much to be done before we get back to a correct use of the word. Like "chapel," it has a legitimate place in the vocabulary of the Church. It is useful in a description of the Church, because it suggests the monarchical form of government, and it indicates the central seat of government. This use of it does not date from the Reformation, and no one has a right to object when it is used as a descriptive word. What dates from the Reformation is the use of the word as part of the everyday name of the Church, as if "Roman Catholic Church" were her distinctive name. The momentum of past usage partly accounts for the continued use among Catholics of this modification of the name given in the Creed, but only partly. It has to be confessed that another influence has worked in the same direction. Let us suppose that a Catholic traveller visits the University of Oxford. He meets Dr. Fairbairn, and after some conversation he remarks to the Doctor:

"Some time ago you published a book, whose title struck me as somewhat odd. It is called *Catholicism: Roman and Anglican.* To me Catholicism is something unique and not susceptible of division into different kinds."

"Allow me," replies the Doctor, "to call your attention to the fact that another book was published about the same time in Rome by a Professor of Theology, Father Billot, with the title: *Proof of the Truth of the Roman Catholic Church.* You see he justifies me in my use of the word 'Roman'."

"Yes; but he does not justify you in your use of the word 'Anglican'."

"I beg your pardon; he does. Words are not private property. We must take them in the generally received sense. Now, I call two perfectly competent witnesses to testify to the force of the word 'Roman' as used by Father Billot, namely, Doctor Lingard and Cardinal Newman. Lingard says:

"'If we refuse to adopt the appellation *Roman Catholic*, the reason is, because it imports what is irreconcilable with our prin-

ciples, that churches which have separated from the ancient Catholic Church may still have a right to the title of Catholic.' According to Lingard, therefore, Father Billot gives me the right to use 'Anglican' by his use of 'Roman.' And Newman tells us in his *Apologia* that in writing his work on Development his difficulties so cleared away that he ceased to speak of 'Roman Catholics,' and boldly called them Catholics. That is, as he understood it, the word 'Roman' restricts the word 'Catholic,' when the two are united."

"You have made out a strong case, I admit," says the visitor; "but I think I see a way out. I hold with Lingard that the word 'Roman' is out of place in the name of the Church. In fact the Vatican Council has by implication so decided; but the Council also decided that the word may be used in describing the Church, and it must be merely as a descriptive word that Father Billot uses it."

"A name is one thing and a description is another; but this distinction does not hold in the case under discussion. Would you expect a description of the Church in the title or the subtitle of a work on the Church? Anyhow, Father Billot says expressly in the body of the work that the word 'Roman' is added to the very name of the Church; and if, as you say, the Council decided against that, then his is not an example of obedience."

The visitor goes away with the impression that he has been beaten in argument without being convinced in reason. The question for us is: what is at the bottom of it all? A comparison will help to understand. For many years the rulers of France have acted as if they wished to change the name of their country. In their zeal for the republican form of government, they have put upon coins, on postage stamps, and on all official documents, not the name of the country, as is done elsewhere, but *République Française*. It is a weak policy. It would be more becoming a great country to assume, and to act on the assumption, that the form of government is beyond question. The glorious name of France should not be obscured by the desire to give prominence to her form of government. Something similar has happened in the Church. Many theologians, in their zeal for the monarchical form of government in the Church, have acted as if they wished

to change the name of the Church. They seem to imagine that they score a point in favor of the monarchical form by inserting the word 'Roman' in the name of the Church. Perrone goes to the verge of heterodoxy in this direction when he says:

"In the same way as in former times the Church, which was called Christian, had to be called Catholic to distinguish her from sects which also called themselves Christian, so when later heretics and schismatics began to call themselves Orthodox and Catholic, the Church had to be called also *Roman* in order to distinguish her from the sects which usurped the former name."

This teaching may be policy, but it is neither history nor theology. It implies that the Church is not sufficiently designated by the title of Catholic Church. It implies that bodies which separate from the Catholic Church have as much right to retain the title of Catholic as that of Christian. It implies other things equally unfounded; but it is as a policy that it is here considered. The French politicians can at least say for themselves that it is the business of politicians to have a policy and to act on it; but theological professors are beyond their sphere of labor when they meddle with matters of policy. Their subject-matter is a science. They are out of touch with the world of action. To the Bishops belongs the divine right of dealing with matters of policy. These two elements of the Church came into conflict in the Vatican Council over the name of the Church, and the Bishops decided that the ancient name, the name in the Creed, should not be modified.

The Church has never once recognized or admitted "Roman Catholic Church" as her name. On the contrary, whenever the subject has been discussed, and it has been authoritatively discussed, the decision has always been that the name is the Catholic Church, without addition or modification. The conference between the Catholic and the Donatist Bishops at Carthage in 411 is peculiarly instructive. The former naturally spoke of themselves as the Catholics. To this the Donatist Bishops objected with vigor, and a long discussion ensued. The Donatists argued that the question as to who had a right to the Catholic name was a question of doctrine, and that every true Christian had a right to be called Catholic. St. Augustine and the other

Catholic Bishops argued, on the contrary, that it was a question of fact, not of doctrine. They urged unanswerably that the existence of an international Church, a Church embracing the *orbis terrarum*, was a visible fact; that the separation of the Donatists from this Church was a fact equally visible; and that these two facts determined the question of Catholicity, since *Catholic* means that the Church is not confined to one people, but embraces in the unity of organization every variety of people and nation. This is a never failing test. There is only one Church organically independent of national boundaries. Put it in the form of a school question: Name a Church which embraces most of the people in two large and independent nations, and is at the same time organically one Church. There is only one, and it is for that reason called the Catholic Church. By embracing two such nations she manifests the power to embrace all. By their inability to embrace even two such nations, all other churches show that they can never claim to be Catholic. The problem is this: how to throw a network of ecclesiastical organization over two or more independent nations without its breaking along the lines of national cleavage. There is only one Church on earth able to do it, and therefore there can never come the need of changing the name of the Catholic Church. There does not exist one Greek Church for all who call themselves the Orthodox Greeks. There are as many independent Greek Churches as there are independent nations of that faith. Anglicans strive to revive the Donatist test of Catholicity and make it a question of doctrine. Thus, Canon Dixon, in his *History of the Church of England*, says: "The opposite of Catholic is not Protestant but herectic; the opposite of Protestant is not Catholic but Papist." Father Tyrrell, S.J., aptly says in his *Faith of the Millions:* "Another point of misunderstanding which hides the face of the Church from intelligent outsiders concerns her Catholicity and independence of national and racial limitations. It is from this she derives her name of Catholic, *i. e.*, the Church of humanity, as opposed to the Church of the Jews." This is the original and genuine meaning of the word Catholic. The opposite of Catholic is national or racial. It is only in an indirect way that heretic becomes the opposite of Catholic, namely, as opposed to the

teaching of the Church *called* Catholic. The word Catholic has two different functions. It expresses an attribute of the Church and it is the name of the Church. As expressing an attribute its opposite is national, but as the name of the Church its opposite is everything opposed to the Church so named. Now, the question whether a given institution is national or merely local or international in its organization is a very simple question of fact, and there is superhuman wisdom in the embodying of so visible and so effective a test of truth in the very name of the Church. One who studies the question from the point of view of the real interests of the Church needs to be on his guard against feelings of anger against those who try to modify and obscure that name as it stands in the Apostles' Creed,—their attempt is so uncalled for, and so clearly a case of grasping at the shadow and letting go the substance. There is no dispute among Catholics about the form of government in the Church; but the face of the Church is in fact obscured to many outside by the custom of calling the Catholic Church by the unauthorized name, the "Roman Catholic Church." The Century Dictionary says that the name Catholic Church is often qualified by prefixing the word *Roman*, "especially by those not acknowledging" the claims of the Church. It would be a great gain if we could truthfully say that the word "especially" should be omitted by the Century. The weight of Catholic practice would then make it as impossible for Episcopalians or Anglicans as it was for the Donatists to appropriate the Catholic name.

Twice during the nineteenth century the question of the name of the Church came up for authoritative decision, and in both cases the decision was that the ancient name should not be qualified by any prefix. At the Congress of the Powers of Europe, held in Vienna, in 1815, one or more of the representatives spoke of the Catholic Church as "Roman Catholic Church." Against this title Cardinal Consalvi, as representative of the Pope, protested. He said that the Church is Roman as well as Catholic, but that the joint use of the two words as the name of the Church could not be admitted. In the Vatican Council the same question presented itself in an indirect way. The first chapter of the Constitution *de fide*, as it came from the Theological Commission, began thus:

"The holy Roman Catholic Church believes and professes that there is one true and living God, etc."

Here there is no direct question of the name of the Church. If the Constitution had been adopted in the proposed form, it would still be open to us to argue that the word "Roman," as well as the word "holy," was put there simply as a descriptive word, and that the name of the Church still remained in its unchanged ancient form of Catholic Church. But the Bishops decided that no risks should be taken in so important a matter as the official name of the Church. They felt that if the proposed form were adopted, many would understand it to mean the adoption of a modified name for the Church; and, after a warm debate, the form was so changed as to make it impossible for anyone to infer therefrom that the name of the Church is other than this: *The Catholic Church.* For there is only one disputed question regarding the name of the Church. Is the word "Roman" a part of that name? The Council decided that it is not, and hence rejected the form "Roman Catholic Church." Then came the question: Is the word "Roman" a proper descriptive word to be used like the word "Apostolic" in speaking of the Church? To this the Council answered in the affirmative. Some curious facts were brought to light in the course of the discussion. One Bishop told of a Catholic in his diocese who had bequeathed some property in his will to the Catholic Church. The Episcopalians applied to the civil courts and obtained possession of the property on the ground that it was not bequeathed to the "Roman Catholic Church," but to that body which the law rccognizes as the Catholic Church of England.[1] The Bishop asked the Vatican Council not to sanction this anti-Catholic assumption of British law. Another told of a long contest he had with the government of a British colony, because the government refused to receive his letters unless they were signed by him as *Roman Catholic Bishop*, and not simply as *Catholic Bishop.* He asked the Council not to oblige him to yield in such contests. And the Council decided not merely that the Church should not

[1] "That body (the Church of England) is supposed by the law of the country to be the ancient and Catholic Church of the country, as well as the national establishment of Religion."—Hon. W. E. Gladstone in *Contemporary Review*, 1875.

be called the Roman Catholic Church, but that not even a pretext should be given for that appellation. There is no express prohibition, but the action of the Council is an implied prohibition, to call the Church by any other name than that given to her in the Apostles' Creed. For, after all, who has the right to modify the name of the Church? Neither Protestant governments nor the Catholics of one or two countries, nor college professors, have that right. To none but the Church herself should we look for guidance in this case. Now the Church has never, in all the centuries of her existence, accepted or sanctioned any other name than that given in the Creed, and, when urged to adopt what might be taken for a modified name, she refused. We have no right to call ourselves Roman Catholics, because this name does not correspond with the name which the Church has given to herself, and because we thereby suggest that there are different kinds of Catholics. Some have attempted to counteract this implication that there are different kinds of Catholics by explaining that "Catholic" and "Roman Catholic" have the same meaning. They might as well attempt to keep away the winter season by furnaces in the open air. When the majority of those who use the name "Roman Catholic" attach a restrictive meaning to the word "Roman," and when adjectives are by their very nature suggestive of restriction, how can an occasional explanation prevent serious misunderstanding? Far better frankly to confess that as we needed reform in the case of the word "chapel," so we now need to reform our use of "Roman Catholic." Some of our prayer-books and catechisms persist in giving to the Church of Christ a name which the Church has refused to accept. But then, it will still be asked, do not some of our best theologians also give the Church that name? Yes, they do sometimes; but when choice has to be made between theologians and the Church, there should be no difficulty in making the choice. It is not a case of conflict in teaching. It is a case that may be expected to occur occasionally by reason of the complex nature of the Church. The Church has not merely the office of teaching; she has also that of ruling. The teaching and the ruling functions are carried on side by side, and they act and react upon each other. Theologians minister to the teaching office. Sometimes they are

restrained in their scientific exposition of revealed truth by the ruling power in the interest of humble souls, because apparent "novelty is often error to those who are unprepared for it, from the refraction with which it enters into their conceptions." Sometimes, on the other hand, theologians encroach on the ruling office, as in this case, of giving a name to the Church. To select a name belongs primarily to the ruling office. It is an act of government. This ebb and flow of the powers within the Church is a slow movement, unless there come a crisis requiring strong action, and another half century may yet elapse before theologians thoroughly realize that to modify the name of the Church does not lie within their sphere of duty.

The theologians of to-day do not seem to know what really took place in the Council during the discussion on this subject. The published *Decreta* do not show on their face that any question regarding the name of the Church was raised. The only published account of it seems to be that of Father Granderath, and if this is correctly represented by Father Hughes in the September number of this REVIEW, theologians have not yet the means of knowing what took place. The gist of it, in the words of Father Hughes, is, "that in Solemn Public Sessions and by Papal confirmation the *name* 'Holy Catholic Apostolic Roman Church' became an official designation of the Church of God, approved and sanctioned by supreme authority." This is not the truth. The word "Apostolic" was inserted and the word "Roman" was transposed for the very purpose of avoiding even the appearance of giving the distinctive name or official designation of the Church, and for the purpose of giving, as other Councils had given, an authentic description of the Church. No theologian would dream of maintaining that in solemn session of the Second Œcumenical Council, and by Papal confirmation, the *name* "One Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church" became an official designation of the Church. It is not a name; it is a description. The Fathers of the fourth century tell us in a hundred different ways that the name of the Church is simply the Catholic Church, which they could not have done if the Second Council had intended to give, not the features, but the name of the Church. It would indeed be rather awkward to have to call

ourselves "Holy Catholic Apostolic Romanists," and that is what we should have to submit to, if Father Hughes' statement were correct. As the people of France are called Frenchmen, and the people of Germany Germans, so the people of the Christian Republic must be designated by its name. The contention in the Vatican Council about the insertion of a comma or the word *and* between "Roman" and "Catholic" meant that there was, on the one side, the purpose of obtaining indirectly official recognition of "Roman Catholic" as a name, and, on the other side, a fixed determination to defeat that purpose. It is too late in the day to contend now that after all the defeat was a victory. The name of the Church is now what it has ever been since the time of the Apostles—the Catholic Church.

When Colonies in America called themselves collectively New England, there was no need of England adopting some other prefix. If another part of the world called itself Little England, and if Australia had called itself Grand England, there would still be no call upon England to apply to Parliament for a prefix. The simple title of England marks her off as the original possessor of the name, and her use of a prefix would only obscure her claim to that position. All others using the name are forced to adopt prefixes. So is it with the Catholic Church. She is the original possessor of the name. The simple title of Catholic Church, recognized by the whole world, witnesses to her claim to be the original possessor. All others, if they use the name at all, are forced to adopt prefixes, such as Old Catholic, Anglo-Catholic, Greek Catholic, Reformed Catholic, etc. It does not matter how many there are of them, if only we have the good sense to avoid the prefix habit. There is no call upon us to place ourselves among the prefixed. It were folly on our part to abandon or obscure our position of preëminence for the sake of any prefix, however honorable that prefix is in itself. No sect or schism has ever dared, or will ever dare, call itself simply the Catholic Church; but some future sect or schism, originating in Italy, may possibly call itself Roman Catholic.

PROPAGANDIST.

"SCHOLASTICISM AND THE MODERN METHOD."

SOME of us who have gone through a course of philosophy in preparation for the priesthood can recall the weary hours we passed during the first years of our acquaintance with Scholasticism. It was hard to find anything to catch our imagination, or fix our attention. The daily torture of thrusting or parrying peripatetic problems which we felt sure our intellectual father Aristotle would have disowned, in Latin which we felt sure our literary father Cicero would have anathematized, was only borne in the hope that some day we should find these studies a help in the great work of winning souls. Yet it was a heavy task to pore over tomes printed abroad, and printed, as we told ourselves, so abominably, with heavy type welded together into interminable paragraphs. We began to look back to our dainty copies of Homer or Horace with their clear type, and their apt notes, not over-learned, but just sufficiently steeped in classical lore to bring the poet into living contact with our souls. We missed the clearly-drawn and gently-toned maps—the full indices, the air of modernity of our histories and geographies, which we grew, alas! to regret when it was too late. Soon we began to ask ourselves, could any social or religious good come of such intellectual jargon as *Barbara, Celarent*?—what was the precise social momentum of a Sorites?—how could the conversion of our fatherland be furthered by a more profound knowledge of *Ens Rationis?*—what were the occult relations between Transcendentalism, say, and the sweating system?—until our mind grew sick within us at the thought of squandering the precious years of life in a quixotic wandering after intellectual will-o'-the-wisps.

No doubt such a period of acute emotion is likely to come and go; come, on the first acquaintance with the deeper philosophic studies; and go, when it is at last clear that to have dug deep down in mental darkness and solitude to the lower strata of first principles is to have advanced the Kingdom of God's Truth on earth.

But a further thought sprang up to take the place of the banished doubt, and grew at length to a difficulty. It was not philosophic teaching with its accompanying abstraction that

appeared fatuous and useless. It was that form of philosophic thought to which our minds were being bent. Our difficulty was not philosophy, but Scholasticism. No doubt this further difficulty would have had its ebb and flow in a natural day, had our minds been allowed to rest. But we were confronted by a solid phalanx of non-Catholic thinkers who ignored Scholasticism, and by a determined band of Catholic apologists, who somewhat timidly defended it. At last our minds wavered before the thoughts from within and suggestions from without, and we somewhat anxiously asked ourselves if there was any truth in the oft-spoken thesis: "Scholasticism must give way to the Modern Method."

To encourage discussion let me set down the results of my own thoughts on this thesis.

I note that the formulator of such a thesis must have found the solution of well-nigh unfathomable difficulties. For, to my mind, it is well-nigh impossible to define what is "Scholasticism," and what the "Modern Method." Now to attempt the defence of a thesis without boundary, mere position without magnitude, is the hope of a bold, perhaps a foolhardy man. And to consider that the subject and predicate of the above thesis can be circumscribed by any satisfactory definition would suggest the proofs or the suspicion that the writer had made up his mind after an easy off-hand glance at a thorny philosophical problem.

To justify these severe criticisms, let us begin by asking ourselves: "What is Scholasticism?" Before we can hope for an answer we must go on to ask: "Who are Scholastics?" It would be useless to write on Feudalism if we made no effort to determine with whom it began and with whom it ended. Yet how difficult it is to say who are scholastics and who are not. Shall we hold the father of Scholasticism to be Peter Lombard, or Hugh of St. Victor, or St. Anselm, or St. John Damascene, or St. Augustine? Did Scholasticism appear merely as a phenomenon of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries? Or does it extend from Boethius in the sixth to Billuart in the eighteenth.

But it would be even a harder task to describe it logically than to circumscribe it chronologically. Its logical content defies identification, as it has defied localization.

Is it a method or a system, or both?

Or is it a literary manner? Is it didascalic or coördinative? Is it practical (μέθοδος), or speculative (σύστημα), or neither, or both?

If Scholasticism is a system, as Platonism and Aristotelianism are held to be systems, then it may be asked, how it contrives to shelter such divergent thinkers as Erigena, Abelard, Aquinas, and Scotus. If we venture to reply that Scholasticism is identical with Thomism, we shall be forced to find a new name for the followers of Scotus, Bonaventure, and Suarez. If we make bold to say that Scholasticism is nothing more than Aristotelianism conditionally baptized, or merely named afresh on its reception into the Church, what name shall be given to the Platonism of Abelard and the Nominalism of William of Occam? Is Scholasticism but another name for Thomism, Bonaventurism, Scotism? Is it Realism, or Nominalism, or Conceptualism, or all three, or none? Thus if we hold it to be a system, we cannot shirk the baffling enquiry, "Which system? Thomism, Scotism, etc.?" And if it is a system, what are its principles? since a system is knowledge of abstract or concrete facts arranged and organized by the light of a principle or principles. Can we maintain historically or logically that Scholasticism is Hylomorphism or Creationism or any other abstract view of Being? All these necessary questions lead us to suspect that our term Scholasticism, at first sight so clear and apparently definable, holds more than we bargained for, and that far from being a fixed system which finds itself antagonistic to modern philosophic thought, it had already been a pioneer of the moderns in every field of truth and heresy.

On the other hand it would seem easier to concede that Scholasticism was a method rather than a system. The influential men of the thirteenth century, the golden age of Scholasticism, were *Doctores*, *i. e.*, teachers rather than thinkers. Their influence lay in their power of summary and their clearness of exposition. They were unapproachable in their successful compilation of text-books. Their highest academic honor was that of Master. And it is the master rather than the discoverer, the teacher rather than the thinker who can write a successful text-book. I am not denying that many of the scholastics of the thirteenth century were true, earnest, and successful thinkers. To concede this is to bear out my contention

that Scholasticism well-nigh defies identification. But, for the sake of argument, I would urge that, on the whole, its professors in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries were teachers imparting organized knowledge through a method, rather than thinkers discovering and organizing knowledge into a system. Yet here again we are perplexed by the recurrence of the question, "Which method?" Is it that of Alcuin, or William of Champeaux, or Bonaventure, or Aquinas, or Capreolus, or Cajetan, or Suarez, or Billuart? If we sometimes read in certain well-meaning but hardly well-informed histories of philosophy that Scholasticism diverges from the modern method by being deductive rather than inductive, we are staggered by the empiric earnestness and accuracy displayed by such a classical scholastic as St. Thomas. Students who wish to refresh their inductive, at the same time as their deductive faculties, might be safely introduced to the Anthropology of the *Summa*. A Thomist can never cease to wonder how it can be said that the *Secunda Secundae* is merely deductive, or even dominantly so. It is deduction pure and simple, or rather is it not a brilliant exercise of induction, and its associate, deduction, to find out and organize the marvellous ethics of Prudence, Justice, Fortitude, and Temperance? Are the Angelic Doctor's subtle searchings into the human heart, its pathology and therapeutics, but a lifeless conclusion from a barren principle? Perhaps the nearest approach to a logical definition of Scholasticism is this: "The scientific attempt to adjust and justify the relations of Faith and Reason, of Natural Knowledge and Supernatural Revelation." Yet if this definition be accepted, Scholasticism must include St. Augustine and St. Irenæus—nay, more, it cannot close the door upon St. Paul discoursing to the Corinthians on the immortality of the body, and St. John reconciling the Incarnation with the Platonic Λογος. Moreover, in case this definition be accepted as a working hypothesis, what becomes of the thesis that Scholasticism must give way to the modern method? Whatever may, or may not, be included under the term "modern method," it is suicidal of Christians to expect that it will finally show the hopelessness of harmonizing the truths that come from God through reason with those that come from God through Revelation.

There would little profit it putting forward the view that Scholasticism, if neither a system nor a method, is, at any rate, a literary manner. The *Stabat Mater* and *Dies Irae* are equally children of Scholasticism with the *Cur Deus Homo* or the *Summa Contra Gentiles.* Moreover, why should the modern mind consider that literary atmosphere to be dampening which has vibrated to every note of literature, from the flawless legal preciseness and personless accuracy of the *Summa* to the rhapsodies of Bernard and Bonaventure?

In answer to all this it may be argued that Scholasticism is not a definite metaphysical, logical, or literary school, but a definite spirit, and that though we may not know its boundaries, we can tell its existence. But will it then be true to say that Scholasticism is wholly hostile to whatever is true and advantageous in the modern method? If the Scholasticism of St. Thomas sought to know and employed all that was true and advantageous in the science of its day, shall we conclude that there must be war to the bitter end between Scholasticism and modern thought, and that no *modus vivendi* can be found between two such powerful forces for good or evil? Surely all this is puzzling enough.

Yet we have not determined what is meant by the modern method, the predicate of our thesis. Here our difficulties thicken rather than diminish. Do we mean the modern philosophic method? And if so, what do we mean by modern? Will Bacon's *Advancement of Learning* be considered too ancient, and Lepidi's *Philosophia* too recent? Must we include such irreconcilables as Descartes and Kant, Hume and Newman, Butler and Voltaire? Is it the modern method of Kant or Hegel or Spencer? Is it idealism, or realism, or transcendentalism, or positivism, or agnosticism, or scepticism, or a fashionable blend of all these in a literary eclecticism? We fell out with Scholasticism on account of its subtlety and obscurity. Shall we fall in love with the limpid clearness of Kant's *Kritik*, or Hegel's *Logik*, or Spencer's *Psychology?* Shall we fly from the futility of *Ens Rationis* to the shelter of the reconciliation of opposites and the absorption of everything in its other? But if we do, we can hardly justify ourselves under the plea of coming more in contact with mankind

and being more serviceable to our flesh and blood. But, perhaps, the modern method is not so much to be found in modern philosophy as in what is called modern science. Here, again, the difficulty is, "What is the modern method"? Is it the method in history, or mathematics, or literature, or physics, or biology? Are we to desert the crazy craft of Scholasticism for the binomial theorem or the romantic school of literature, or the realistic school of art, or the correlation and persistence of force, or the survival of the fittest? Surely, to propound such a thesis is not to reason but to dream. Indeed, it is a dream of the impossible to consider that amongst the myriad writers who have flooded the nineteenth century with works of art, literature, history, philosophy, mathematics, physics, dynamics, chemistry, and biology, there is any one definite spirit which marks them off from the writers of any other age, and gives them a right to supersede the combined scholarship of the scholastics.

General theses are the delight of younger men, and the torture of scholars. Nothing is easier than to frame a general statement, nothing more perplexing than to prove or even explain it. Were it necessary to word a thesis on the subject we have been discussing, the following would, perhaps, be a more definite form than that which we have set down at the head of this article, as the subject of our examination: "Some Characteristics of Scholasticism and Modern Methods; or, Scholasticism and the Philosophic Methods of the Nineteenth Century; or, Scholastic Philosophy and Modern Inductive Methods." But even such narrowly restricted theses as these cover much ground and tend to spread out in useless generalizations.

Of greatest importance to us who are called upon to profess a knowledge of philosophy and theology is the survey of our scholastic curriculum in detail with a view to supplementing it with the established findings of modern scholarship. A detailed attempt to provide such a survey would overtax the natural limits of an article in THE ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW. But we may allow ourselves to sketch the lines on which such an undertaking should run. Not to deal with abstractions, let us consider psychology, cosmology, metaphysics, theology, and ecclesiastical history. Leaving metaphysics out of consideration for the

moment, we may note a striking difference between modern scholarship and all that preceded it. Modern scholars either adopt or consider the momentous factor of evolution. Thus in psychology, though much has been done in recent years to make scientific observations and conclusions in physico-psychology and psychometry, yet the most important modern addition to psychology is the evolutionary view of the phylogenetic origin of organs and faculties. No Catholic philosopher can be fully equipped for his work, if he has not made himself acquainted with the *Principles of Psychology* of Herbert Spencer, or with works advocating the same or like views of *psychology*.

The student of *cosmology* must either accept or at least deal with the evolutionary theory of the universe. He will probably be surprised to observe how the generalization underlying evolution serves as a useful explanatory formula in geology and biology—nay, that it becomes the most convenient working principle for classifying and systematizing the vast materials and objects of these sciences.

In *metaphysics* a transcendental evolution must occupy the attention of Catholic philosophers. But the supreme subject of discussion must remain that of realism and the consequent subject of causality. Modern Catholic philosophers are perhaps meagre in their treatment of such fundamental questions, though much, if not all of this meagreness may be explained by the exigencies of a handbook.

The Catholic *theologian* has to deal with a many-sided form of evolution. He is brought face to face with the evolutionary theory of religion, and that complex form of it which we term Christianity. He must be prepared to give a patient hearing to philosophers who consider modern Christian religious thought and activity to be no more than a highly evolved emotional complex of the most interesting species of vertebrata. Moreover, in his discussions with heretics and schismatics, he will probably find himself forced to adopt some form of development, if he is to vindicate the continuity of our marvellously complex and organized theology, discipline and liturgy with the apparent simplicity of primitive Christianity. Furthermore, the transcendental evolution put forward by such as Hegel must be considered even when

not adopted by all Catholic students of the divine internal processions which are the basis of the Trinity, and the external processions which result in creation.

The Catholic *historian* must be prepared to follow the masters of modern history in their patient research, in their painstaking classifications, in the accuracy of their facts, in the reserve and rarity of their conclusions.

In all the above spheres of intellectnal activity, the modern scholastic who puts himself in touch with modern methods of philosophical, theological, or historical research must ever feel conscious of the thought that, far from diluting his mind with thoughts uncongenial to Scholasticism, he is but drinking more deeply of the spirit of such true scholastics as Bl. Albert the Great, and St. Thomas Aquinas. We must distinguish here as elsewhere between two very distinct questions—the scholastic methods of teaching philosophy, and the scholastic method of teaching.

Education in the Middle Ages, even as in the twentieth century, was not a fruitless search after the philosopher's stone, nor yet a spinning of intellectual cobwebs from the premises of a foolish credulity. No one was taken to have finished his scholastic course of study until he had mastered the *Quadrivium* and the *Trivium;* or, in other words, until he had acquired a satisfactory knowledge of what the scholarly world then knew of mathematics, history, physical science, and philosophy. It is clear from the pages of the *Summa* that St. Thomas was deeply versed in all the sciences of his day. His range of thought extends from the heights of the Trinity to the various forms of a commonwealth and the lawfulness of ruses in war. His last days, passed on a sick-bed, in the peacefulness of his Cistercian shelter, were employed in commenting on the Canticle of Canticles, and, if we may believe tradition, in writing a work on aqueducts. No one could profess to have inherited his scholastic method or spirit who would stand aloof from the scientific acquirements of his own times in mathematics, history, the natural sciences, and philosophy.

Perhaps there are concrete reasons why modern methods of discovery and teaching throw some minds out of touch with the Scholasticism of our modern philosophical curricula. There is

the fact that philosophy is practically viewed by us as an introduction to theology. Such a view, though undoubtedly true, is not self-recommendatory to men who look on theology as a belated survival of spook and ancestry worship. When men of this mental make are asked to give their sympathy to modern scholastic methods they feel that they are but asked to take under their roof a stranger who will turn out to be an enemy. They find it utterly repugnant to taste, not to say assimilate, a doctrine which prepares the mind for Transubstantiation or the Trinity. They will have none of a method which disciplines the mind to rise up to an act of faith. They almost feel that were they to toy with Scholasticism, it would go hard with them if they did not come to hold every mystery from the Trinity to the Ascension, and submit to every Catholic rite from Baptism and Confession to the adoration of the Cross and the sprinkling of blessed ashes. Scholastics have toiled successfully to prove that philosophy is the handmaid of theology. And modern scholars of a certain school take care that if the handmaid shares in the honor, she shall still more share in the disrepute, of her mistress.

Another reason for the divorce between Scholasticism and some phases of modern thought is to be found not in its relations to theology but in its relations to theologians, who, through good luck or ill, are now our only or our chief scholastic philosophers. It would be euphemism to say that the Scholasticism as presented by some of our modern text-book makers is a mind-forming, though it may well be a mind-informing, system and method. It is sometimes painful to the careful spectator of modern thought to read from time to time in our reviews how certain excellent second-class text-books are "epoch-making," "masterly summaries," "without which no priest's library can be complete," and so on. As a confirmed and unrepentant student of one of the fountain-heads of Scholasticism I may venture to ask if the stream has not been greatly mudded and puddled by the restless feet of these commentators. The numberless *Cursus Sacrae Theologiae* are not such stimulating nectar as the *Summa*. If we have gone away from the fount and dug wells to ourselves, our longing for a more invigorating Scholasticism is not unnatural. To slake our thirst we must go further up the stream. Our modern authors

are not to be despised, nor must the above words be conceived as a reproach to men who are above reproach. But they themselves would be the first to own that in their struggles with the profusion of modern developments in theology and philosophy, the old philosophical spirit of brilliant analogy and generalization has become well nigh a lost art. A commentary on the *De Trinitate* of St. Thomas will now be thrice the bulk of the text. Theologian philosophers must never forget that as in architecture, so also in philosophy, the mind of genius is detected in the planning of main lines, in the balanced contrast of masses, in the gradation and juxtaposition of color, in the happy and natural employment of material to its best advantage, in the foresight of atmospheric effects, in the unity of conception based on unity of aim, in the noble achievement of concentrating the most thought in the scantiest material. It will be a joyful day for modern Scholasticism when we train not merely the logical, but the thinking faculties by personal contact with the great architects of Scholasticism. Two questions still remain to be suggested in this querulous paper: "Is our modern seminarian philosophy rightly and accurately called Scholasticism?" which I suppose it is; and, "Are our modern professors and pupils moved by the youthful, enthusiastic, empiric, apostolic spirit of the true Scholastics?"—which they must settle for themselves.

VINCENT MCNABB, O.P.

Woodchester, England.

CARENTIA OVARIORUM EST IMPEDIMENTUM DIRIMENS MATRIMONIUM.

CONTRA Dissertatiunculam nostram "*Carentia ovariorum est impedimentum dirimens matrimonium*" cl. P. Hild, C.SS.R., insurrexit propositionem contradictoriam propugnans. De quo quam maxime laetamur; disputationibus enim veritas veluti expolitur ac pulchrior affulget. Nam veritas, ut ait Augustinus, volentibus vel nolentibus hominibus, vincat oportet; ipsique veritatis oppugnatores opere suo nonnisi splendorem eius magis magisque patefacere valent.

Quod et in casu nostro evenisse iam patet; non solum enim illustris adversarius sententiam nostram intactam omnino reliquit; sed conatu ac patrocinio suo peiorem ipsius causam reddidit, ut clare patebit.

I.

In primis, ut aliquid generaliter innuamus, in articulo nostro synthesis totius Dissertationis invenitur syllogismo sequenti: *Ex Ecclesia* invalide contrahit matrimonium qui impedimento impotentiae laborat; atqui *ex physiologia* mulier carens ovariis laborat impedimento impotentiae; ergo mulier sine ovariis matrimonium valide contrahere non potest.

Iamvero illustris opponens nonnisi propositionem minorem impetere poterat, et hoc fecit, verum impotentiae conceptum pervertendo: mulierem enim sine ovariis *sterilem* vocavit, quam nos *impotentem habemus;* et sic minorem propositionem syllogismi negavit. Cum igitur adversario ac nobis identicus non sit conceptus impotentiae, praestat illum recte determinare, ut possibilis evadat controversia.

Age vero: impotentia in subiecta materia definitur ab ipso adversario: *inaptitudo ad copulam perfectam;* quod nos ultro concedimus. Ast copula, iuxta praecl. adversarium cum praecl. duce suo Eschbach, est perfecta, quando *vir naturale debitum femineum vas penetrando, in istud semen verum effundit.*

Sed haec definitio est omnino reiicienda, utpote inadaequata et contraria doctrinae *certae* S. Alphonsi et S. Thomae, quos illustris adversarius pro se citare non haesitavit.—(*a*) Est inadaequata; quia non continet omnia elementa necessaria; nam copula completa seu perfecta amplecti debet tum organa hominis, tum organa *necessaria* mulieris, tum eorum *essentialem aptitudinem pro fine*, ad quem actus coniugalis ordinatur. Definitio autem adversarii est unilateralis, vel saltem si respicit hominem adaequate, non respicit adaequate mulierem. Ubinam gentium enim didicit cl. adversarius ad copulam perfectam maritalem, de qua sola hic solliciti sumus, semen hominis esse necessarium, et nihil ex parte feminae requiri? Ratio ob quam in definitione copulae seu coitus maritalis ponitur hominis semen est, non quia illud necessarium est ad copulam materialem, sed ad copulam formalem, scilicet aptam

ad generationem. Ast pro copula apta ad generationem necessarium est tam semen hominis, quam ovulum feminae. Cur igitur hoc discrimen inter hominem et mulierem, ut in definitione copulae necessarium putetur semen hominis, et praetermittatur ex parte feminae id, quod aequivalet hominis semini, scilicet ovulum? Nonne membrum viri relativum est vasi feminae; sicut semen eius relativum est feminae ovulo? Et tamen in definitione copulae maritalis ab adversario ponitur membrum virile, vas femineum, semen hominis, et non feminae ovulum!

Uti patet, adversarius non definit copulam formalem, seu coitum maritalem perfectum; sed tantummodo materialem et quidem partialiter. Ergo definitio copulae perfectae ab adversario ex cl. Eschbach prolata est omnino reiicienda, utpote evidentissime inadaequata.

(*b*) Praeterea illa definitio est apertissime contraria doctrinae S. Alphonsi et S. Thomae. Juxta S. Alphonsum, in hypothesi de necessitate seminis feminei pro generatione, mulier, quae seminare non valet, *est impotens*, etiamsi vas eius membro viri penetretur, ac in illud verum semen effundatur. Perlegat illustris adversarius L. 6, n. 1095, ubi S. Alphonsus ita loquitur: "Impotentia in femina esse censetur, quando vel seminare non potest, *si verum est semen feminarum requiri ad generationem*, vel propter arctitudinem non potest virum pati, aut eius semen recipere." Ergo iuxta S. Alphonsum definitio allata a cl. adversario ex cl. Eschbach est reiicienda, saltem in hypothesi de necessitate feminei seminis ad generationem. Quod autem S. Alphonsus affirmat hypothetice de semine feminae, absolute est nunc affirmandum, si loco seminis feminei ponatur ovulum, quod certissime necessarium est ad generationem.

Idem S. Alphonsus L. 6, n. 1095, Res. 3, haec habet: "Impotentia, de qua loquimur, est illa, propter quam coniuges non possunt copulam habere *per se aptam ad generationem:* unde sicut validum est matrimonium inter eos, qui possunt copulari, esto *per accidens* nequeant generare, puta quia steriles aut senes; vel quia femina semen non retinet; ita nullum est matrimonium inter eos, qui nequeant consummare *eo actu, quo ex se esset possibilis generatio.*" Definitio adversariorum clarius condemnari non posset. Nam iuxta S. Alphonsum adest coitus, et coitus, scilicet

coitus aptus ad generationem, et coitus non aptus. Coitus aptus est ille, quo *ex se* esset *possibilis* generatio: quod nullo modo verificatur in coitu cum femina ovariis totaliter carente; coitus non aptus est ille, quo *ex se non* esset *possibilis* generatio: hic autem nullum reddit matrimonium, et plene verificatur in coitu cum femina ovariis totaliter carente. Insuper iuxta S. Alphonsum coitus, *per quem vir naturale debitum femineum vas penetrando, in istud semen verum effundit*, non est aptus ad generationem, et proinde matrimonium nullum reddit, si femina per se seminare non potest: seu si femina caret ovulis et ovariis. Ergo definitio adversariorum est contraria doctrinae S. Alphonsi.

Praeterea est contraria doctrinae S. Thomae. Angelicus Doctor *S. q. 55*, a. 4, ad 2, ait: "Vir et mulier efficiuntur in carnali copula *una caro per commixtionem seminum.*" Et ratio ob quam concubitus contra naturam non causat affinitatem, est, iuxta S. Thomam S. q. 55, a. 3, ad. 3: "quia ibi non habetur commixtio seminum, quae possit esse causa generationis." Et sic iuxta S. Thomam non habetur copula perfecta, seu coitus maritalis perfectus, quo vir et mulier efficiuntur una caro, et quo *affinitas* causatur; nisi semen hominis misceatur, seu misceri *possit* semini, seu ovulo mulieris. Et sic definitio copulae maritalis a cl. adversario ex Eschbach prolata, utpote ovuli necessitatem excludens, est contraria doctrinae S. Thomae; etenim commixtione illa tum in actu tum in potentia absolute ac necessario exclusa, ut accidit in muliere ovariis totaliter carente, non habetur amplius copula seu *coitus maritalis*, sed materialis congressus, qui matrimonium non respicit.

Unde cl. Bucceroni, *Instit. Theol. Mor. Ed. IV Romae, vol. II, n. 994*, de doctrina S. Thomae in re nostra ita loquitur: "Profecto ex S. Doctore ad essentiam matrimonii non pertinet potentia ad *copulam* seu coniunctionem carnalem, seu corporum, *quamcunque*, secus intelligi possit etiam copula sodomitica; sed potentia ad copulam carnalem *coniugalem:* et haec alia non est ex *tota doctrina angelici Doctoris in Suppl.*, quam illa, *quae ordinatur ad generationem.*"

Ex quibus omnibus patet in conceptu coitus *maritalis* necessario includi id, quod est essentiale generationi. Datur enim coitus sodomiticus; coitus vel per se vel per accidens ineptus ad

generationem; coitus per se aptus ad generationem. Hic ultimus tantummodo matrimonium validum reddit. Ille autem, per quem vir naturale debitum femineum vas penetrando, in istud semen verum effundit, non est per se aptus ad generationem, si femina ovariis totaliter careat; ergo matrimonium validum non reddit.

Adferat illustris adversarius, si valet, testimonium ex S. Thoma ex S. Alphonso, vel ex aliquo magnae notae theologo seu Canonista, qui clare et explicite affirmet, coitum *per se* ineptum ad generationem sufficere ad matrimonium validum constituendum. Dicat adversarius utrum coitus inter virum et mulierem, utroque ovario absolute carentem, sit *per se* aptus ad generationem.

Ut paucis innuamus: coitus perfectus maritalis, seu copula perfecta non concipitur, nisi omnia elementa ibi contineantur, quae necessaria sunt ad generationem, ad quam essentialiter copula ipsa ordinatur. Et quoniam ovulum feminae eiusdem omnino necessitatis sit ac semen hominis; sequitur ad coitum maritalem ovaria necessario requiri; sequitur mulierem ovariis totaliter carentem laborare impedimento impotentiae; sequitur syllogismum nostrum, quo tota thesis continetur, nullo modo offendi animadversionibus cl. adversarii; sequitur tandem illius definitionem copulae perfectae esse inadaequatam, et contrariam doctrinae S. Alphonsi et S. Thomae.

II.

Quae breviter hic superius tetigimus satis esse deberent ad quamcunque cl. adversarii obiectionum vim infringendam; nam totus eius articulus fundatur in falsa definitione coitus coniugalis, quam ipse ex cl. Eschbach mutuavit. Praestat tamen aliquid particulariter diversis eius obiectis hic subiungere.

1. Cl. adversarius adserit nos plane confundere re ipsa impotentiam *coeundi* cum impotentia *generandi*. Confusio mihi videtur adesse tota in articulo ipsius. De quonam coitu enim loquitur ipse? De coitu sodomitico, de coitu non maritali, vel de maritali? Impotentia coeundi maritaliter certissime implicat impotentiam generandi; sicut impotentia *per se* generandi est impotentia coeundi coitu *maritali*. Ast impotentia *per accidens* generandi non est impotentia neque coeundi neque *per se* generandi. Adversarius supponit dari posse coitum maritalem simul cum impotentia

physica et absoluta generandi, quod falsum est, ut supra exposuimus. Deinde adversarius confundit explicite et clarissime impotentiam absolutam et physicam generandi cum sterilitate, quae est toto coelo diversa, ut in praecedenti articulo explicavimus.

Quod ab illo dicitur de *maiore* impotentia in muliere carente ovariis, et de *minore* in vetula ovariis omnino exsiccatis praedita, est arbitrarium, cum in articulo nostro non reperiatur.

Arbitraria est etiam accusatio de inconstantia ex hoc, quod atrophiam organorum essentialium docuerimus esse impotentiam; et tamen vetulis, atrophia etiam *absoluta* ovariorum ex senectute laborantibus, matrimonium permittere, *iuxta ipsum, debeamus*. Cl. Antonellius enim tunc atrophiam impotentiam importare dixit, quando illa talis est, ut copula *ex natura sua necessario* infecunda sit. Hoc autem evenire potest tum in senibus tum in iuvenibus. Quid potius respondet adversarius, si vir senex, quamvis erectionem patiatur et *materialem* copulam perficere queat, ob senectutem tamen careat semine, quod ipse in definitione coitus posuit?

Cl. adversarius deinde pro conceptu *theologico* determinando citat homines laicos theologiae ieiunos, quod frustraneum esse nemo non videt.

2. Cl. adversarius miratur in Dissertatione nostra nullam inveniri responsionem ad *valde doctam* et *gravem* opinionis nostrae *refutationem*, quam profert cl. Eschbach. Et nos e contra miramur ipsum *coctum recoquere*, cum in toto articulo repetat argumenta cl. Eschbach, quae cl. Antonellius Romae duobus editis opusculis in nihilum redegit. Unde clariss. De Luca post disputationem inter Eschbach et Antonellium iustissime iudicavit: "Antonellius Rev.mum P. Eschbachium *palmarie* refutat." De caetero neque scopus Dissertationis nostrae, neque natura illorum argumentorum, iam refutatorum, requirebant quod ab adversario desideratur.

3. Cl. adversarius adserit opinionem nostram contradicere verae doctrinae hucusque traditae. Cui respondemus *duas* usque ad nostram fere aetatem fuisse scholas relate ad definitionem copulae perfectae maritalis, pro duabus scholis physiologicis, scilicet pro duabus opinionibus physiologicis, quarum unius auctor fertur Aristoteles, alterius vero Hippocrates et Galenus. Docuit Aristoteles *L. 2. de gen. animal. c. 2.*, feminam nullum semen dare ad

prolem concipiendam, sed tantum materiam. Docuerunt Hippocrates et Galenus feminam etiam subministrare debere proprium semen; quod, mixtione facta cum semine virili, sobolem gigneret.

Inde factum est, ut duae theologorum scholae originem haberent, quarum una amplexa est doctrinam Aristotelis, et copulam maritalem perfectam definivit, quin in definitione semen mulieris includeret; altera vero oppositam physiologicam Hippocratis et Galeni sententiam amplexa est, et copulam maritalem perfectam tali modo definivit, ut explicite ibi includeret quidquid est necessarium ad generationem tum ex parte viri tum ex parte feminae.

Duae illae oppositae scholae igitur conveniebant in aliquid, non conveniebant in aliud. Conveniebant quando *theologice* loquebantur; scilicet quando copulam perfectam pro valore matrimonii exigebant; et quando copulam non perfectam, scilicet *per se physice* et *necessario* ineptam ad generandum, matrimonium invalidum reddere adserebant. Non conveniebant vero quando loquebantur *physiologice*, scilicet quando elementa, ad copulam perfectam necessaria, in concreto determinare vellent, quaerentes utrum semen mulieris (quod hodie *ovulum* vocatur) sit essentiale ad generationem necne. Nonnulli enim respondebant *affirmative* cum Aristotele; alii cum Hippocrate et Galeno respondebant *negative*.

Inde duae scholae, inde usque ad nostram fere aetatem duae sententiae *hypotheticae*, quae tantum valent, quantum valent hypotheses; tamdiu durant, quamdiu durant hypotheses; tamdiu probabilitatis robur retinent, quamdiu certitudo non exurgat, quae falsam alterutram hypothesim reddat. At si errores physiologici supprimantur, utriusque scholae theologi in idem conspirant, nullaque inter eos discrepantia deprehenditur.

Jamvero cum certissimum nunc sit hypothesim Aristotelis esse falsam, ac proinde suppositum illorum theologorum, qui eum secuti sunt, esse falsum; et cum suppositum illorum theologorum, qui Hippocratem et Galenum sunt secuti, sit verum, si loco seminis adhibetur nomen ovuli; sequitur necessario scholam illam hypotheticam, cui cl. adversarius opinionem nostram contradicere adserit, non amplius neque probabilitatis robur retinere.

De caetero theologi antiqui non poterant de ovulis et ovariis loqui, cum neque eorum existentiam perspectam haberent. Et sic

opinio nostra adversatur doctrinae alterius scholae, quae fundabatur in falso supposito, et quae fuit *vera hypothetice;* sed nunc ipsa est *certissime falsa* ob falsitatem suppositi, quo nitebatur.

Cl. adversarius deinde citat pro se S. Thomam, S. Bonaventuram, Sanchez ac S. Alphonsum. Sed, pace illius, *citationes non sunt ad rem,* cum summi illi Theologi loquantur de sterilitate, quae cum matrimonio consistere potest, non autem de impotentia physica et absoluta generandi, prouti habetur ex ovariorum absentia totali. Et iam vidimus S. Thomam et S. Alphonsum reiicere principia adversarii in hac materia.

Relate ad verba S. Thomae *S. 58, art. 1, ad. 3,* ab adversario citata, ita loquitur cl. Bucceroni loc. cit.: "Senibus et sterilibus matrimonium ex A. D. *conceditur secundum quod est in remedium, quamvis non competat eis* (nempe *de facto* non competat eis) *secundum quod est in officium, naturae;* minime vero *quamvis eis competere non possit* secundum quod in officium naturae, stante *physica impotentia* ad generandum. Hoc enim ex A. D. reddit matrimonium impossibile. Loquens enim de triplici matrimonii bono, prolis, fidei, sacramenti, ait quod bonum prolis est principalius, et essentialius, immo principalissimum et essentialissimum: 'Proles est essentialissimum in matrimonio.' Quomodo istud *essentialissimum* haberetur, si in matrimonio sufficeret copula *per se inepta ad generationem?* Ita ergo senibus et sterilibus matrimonium competere potest ut, istud essentialissimum non desideretur, nempe non *in actu,* sed in potentia. Immo ita est iterum istud essentiale et essentialissimum, ut neque illi senes, neque alii omnes matrimonio coniuncti possint ex A. D. *licite* in copula carnali intendere remedium, quin simul intendant officium naturae. Quid igitur si *positive* excludant, positive reddendo impossibile illud officium, et quoad liceitatem copulae post contractum matrimonium, et quoad ipsius matrimonii contrahendi validitatem?" Ex quo iam patet quinam sit verborum S. Thomae et aliorum sensus.

Adversarius supponit finem secundarium matrimonii dari simul cum impotentia physica et absoluta generandi: quod est idem ac supponere finem secundarium matrimonii *sine* matrimonio. Ad rem cl. Bucceroni in suo "*Casus Consc.*" Ed. IV, ita loquitur: "Impossibile est quod matrimonium sit ad mutuum *quoque* vitae

adiutorium et ad concupiscentiam sedandan, *nisi sit matrimonium.* Atqui matrimonium essentialiter coniunctio in ordine ad prolem est (*saltem in potentia per se*) . . . Ubi autem physice impossibilis proles, impossibilis est coniunctio in ordine ad ipsam" (*ac proinde impossibile est matrimonium, impossibile mutuum quoque vitae adiutorium*, impossibilis concupiscentiae sedatio).

Ex Schmaltzgr. l. 4, t. 15, n. 32: "Remedium concupiscentiae haberi debet non per *quamcunque* copulam; sed per eam, quae *ex natura sua* sit apta ad generationem prolis." Unde verba S. Thomae, ab adversario allegata, intelligenda sunt *supposita potentia generandi, seu habendi copulam maritalem perfectam*, sine qua matrimonium consistere non potest.

(*b*) Quae speciatim ex S. Alphonso allegantur, intelligenda sunt eodem modo, scilicet iuxta principia S. Alphonsi. Unde haec verba: "Valide contrahunt steriles, quia etsi SINT *impotentes* (per accidens) *ad generationem*, non tamen ad copulam, etc.," haec verba, inquam, nullo modo se possunt referri ad feminam ovariis carentem, cum ipse S. Alphonsus eodem in loco aliquantulum inferius dicat, impossibilitatem habendi copulam per se aptam ad generationem constituere veram impotentiam, quae matrimonium invalidat. Ergo in loco, ab adversario citato, verba *impotentes ad generationem* referuntur ad steriles, seu ad impotentes *per accidens*, ac proinde non sunt ad rem.

4. (*a*) Cl. adversarius adserit S. Alphonsum docere "*matrimonium subsistere posse* TANTUMMODO propter sedandam concupiscentiam, exclusa etiam *possibilitate* illius finis primarii," et ad hoc probandum citat *L. 6, n. 882, magis versus finem.* Veniam petimus a cl. adversario, si dicere cogimur ipsum hic non retulisse doctrinam S. Alphonsi, qui in eodem loco ita loquitur: "Ad rationem autem contrariae sententiae; nempe quod sit deordinatio *eligere* finem secundarium prae primario; respondetur, quod deordinatio quidem esset si ordinaretur finis primarius ad secundarium, sed non si ex *duobus* finibus licitis secundarius prae primario *eligatur*." Ex hisce verbis clarissime patet S. Alphonsum non solum non excludere finem primarium, quando adserit licere, tantum ad vitandam incontinentiam, matrimonium inire; sed ipsum supponere; secus enim non haberetur *electio* finis secundarii prae primario: electio enim saltem inter duo esse debet. Et tamen adversarius

confidenter scribit: "Et nihilosecius S. Alphonsus *et tot ac tanti cum eo theologi tenent, etc.*"

Aliud est licitum esse matrimonium inire *ad vitandam incontinentiam tantummodo*, quod non excludit possibilitatem generationis; aliud est matrimonium *subsistere* posse tantummodo propter sedandam concupiscentiam, exclusa etiam possibilitate generationis. Illud admittitur a S. Alphonso, non alterum.

(*b*) Quae cl. adversarius refert ex. cl. Eschbach ad respondendum comparationi nostrae inter feminas castratas et homines castratos, iam confutata sunt in principio, quando verum conceptum coitus maritalis determinavimus. Cl. Eschbach enim tenet cum adversario nostro, veram copulam coniugalem haberi posse simul cum impotentia absoluta et physica generandi, quod est falsum; et cum responsiones ipsius fulciantur illo falso supposito, cadunt omnes cum ipso.

(*c*) Adversarius accusat nos de mutilatione verborum in Decisionibus S. Officii referendis: quam mutilationem, iuxta ipsum, commisimus praetermittendo haec verba: *Re mature diuque perpensa.* At haec verba nihil omnino adiungunt Decisionibus S. Congregationis, quae semper *diu matureque rem perpendit.* Omisimus illa verba, quae sunt formula communis, quae solet a S. Congregatione affingi generatim omnibus Decisionibus, ut brevitati consuleremus, quin aliquid substantiale decisionis omitteremus. Unde miramur cl. adversarium innocuam illam omissionem notasse.

Prosequitur cl. adversarius aperte et clare innuens, illas duas Decisiones S. Officii esse tamquam leges generales: et, ut hoc probet, provocat ad *praxim* nonnullorum theologorum (quos in hoc laudare non deberet), qui illas Decisiones tamquam leges generales citant. Sed cl. adversarius non deberet hoc in casu citare pro se illos theologos, qui violant *praxi* principia *theoretica* ab ipsis inculcata, uti iam vidimus in articulo praecedenti relate ad D'Annibale ac Génicot. De caetero quomodo potest illustris adversarius provocare ad D'Annibale, qui in *4a ed. 1897, vol. 2, n. 431, nota 9*, ita loquitur: "Nubere non prohibetur mulier, quae 1° *sterilis* effecta est per utriusque ovarii excisi defectum (S. U. I. 3 Feb. 1887), quia sterilitas non idem est ac impotentia; vel 2° utero careat, *dummodo concipere possit.* Utrum

vero concipere possit necne, medicorum iudicio relinquimus?" Uti apparet, Card. D'Annibale in primo casu supponit in muliere potentiam, seu possibilitatem physicam generandi (*sterilis* effecta) vel ob operationem non perfectam, vel ob ovaria supplementaria. Et certe si ovariorum excisio talis esset, ut mulier per illam fieret tantummodo sterilis, nubere non prohiberetur. In altero casu permittit matrimonium vel non, secundum quod mulier generare potest vel secus, de quo medicos iudices declarat. Principia nostra igitur Cardinalis D'Annibale admittit, scilicet: mulierem ovariis carentem matrimonium inire non posse, si physice et absolute generare non valet, de quo medici iudicabunt.

Hoc unum certum est autem, Decisiones S. Officii in duobus praefatis casibus, etiam post animadversiones cl. Opponentis, nihil aliud esse, nisi Decisiones particulares pro casibus omnino particularibus, quorum circumstantiae ignorantur. Non sunt neque decreta generalia, neque leges. Quapropter non sunt ad rem ea, quae cl. adversarius citat ex *Il Monitore* Cardinalis Génnari, qui ibi loquitur de promulgatione *legum* ecclesiasticarum, et adversarius illa arbitrario duabus illis particularibus Decisionibus applicat. Adversarius exclamat emphatice: "Ubi S. Officium non distinguit, nec nos distinguere debemus." Respondeo: Ubi S. Officium non confundit, nec nos confundere debemus.

(*d*) Cl. adversarius animadvertens in aliud argumentum nostrum, quo demonstravimus carentiam ovariorum esse carentiam rei, contractui matrimoniali *essentialis;* unde matrimonium cum tali muliere est invalidum, tamquam si celebretur sub conditione in pactum deducta vitandae prolis; citat S. Bonaventuram, qui loquens de hac re distinguit inter carentiam sive absentiam prolis naturalem et artificialem; et adserit contractum matrimonialem posse esse *sine* prole et *contra* prolem. Si est contra prolem, est invalidum matrimonium, si est sine prole, est validum. Hoc autem *sine* prole intelligendum est in sterilibus et in continentibus, ut ait S. Bonaventura; non autem in casu de femina ovariis penitus orbata, quae non est sterilis, sed impotens. Et si sensus verborum non esset iste, illa verba plus nimio probarent, et essent falsissima. Unde citatio illa ex S. Bonaventura *Opera omnia, om. IV, p. 720,* non est ad rem.

Citatio autem ex Doctore Angelico S. 49, a. 3, non contradicit

argumento nostro, neque ubi ovaria matrimonio essentialia dicimus, neque ubi invalidum dicimus matrimonium ob conditionem vitandae prolis. Et si S. Thomas prolem, tamquam intentionem prolis, vocat essentialissimum in matrimonio, sequitur ex ipso essentialissimum esse id, quod est necessarium ad prolem, prouti sunt ovaria in femina.

(*e*) Cl. adversarius adserit quatuor Decisiones ex S. C. Concilii a nobis allatas confirmare opinionem eius; quatenus in illis quatuor casibus mulier semper carebat *vase* debito pro coitu. Hic discimus adversarium habere pro vase debito coitus, *non generativi*, non solum vaginam, sed etiam uterum! Ad memoriam ipsius tamen revocamus etiam in casu a S. Congr. S. O. die 30 Julii 1890 deciso, mulierem passam fuisse ablationem uteri, quem ipse vas debitum putat; et nihilominus S. Congr. respondit: "Matrimonium non esse impediendum." Etiam hic adversarius eadem aequivocatione laborat, quod scilicet coitus maritalis sit possibilis sine potentia physica generandi.

(*f*, *g*) Quod adseritur a cl. adversario de publicatione cl. Bucceroni, et de opinionibus nonnullorum Professorum Romanorum, videtur nobis exaggeratum et nimis probare. Nos quaerimus veritatem, et nihil aliud.

(*h*) Tandem cl. adversarius inurgit contra nos ex eo, quod scripsimus: "Quid tandem dicendum de moralitate oppositae sententiae? Neminem latet ipsam onanismi crimini viam latissimam aperire etc." Uti patet, nos comparationem instituentes inter nostram et oppositam sententiam, hanc coniugibus ansam pro onanismo committendo praebere adseruimus; et hoc etiam in hypothesi de validitate matrimonii cum muliere castrata; unde non diximus copulam illam esse obiective onanisticam, quod erat demonstrandum; sed *viam* onanismi crimini *aperire*. Deterriti detestabilibus delictis, quibus in magnis praesertim civitatibus, ex medicorum confessione feminae tam multae abscissionem ovariorum arte sibi procurant ad prolem vitamdam, vel ad indulgendum impune passionibus effrenatis; deterriti malis, quorum ferax est illa sententia tum contra pacem domesticam, tum contra singulos homines et contra societatem, nos iterum atque iterum clamabimus: sententia, quae tenet mulieres penitus carentes ovariis matrimonium valide contrahere posse, non solum onanismi crimini viam aperit, sed

societatem ac familiam turbat ac irreparabiliter offendit. Ita ut, etiam in hypothesi quod carentia ovariorum non sit impedimentum dirimens matrimonium *de iure naturae*, desiderandum esset ut summus Pontifex tale impedimentum constitueret *de iure ecclesiastico*. De caetero in hypothesi de veritate sententiae nostrae, quod nos propugnamus, copula illa esset revera onanistica.

Cl. adversarius pro sustinenda opinione sua ac nostra infirmanda exclamat: "non debet quisquam vel magis catholicus esse, vel plus sapere quam Roma ipsa." Sed nonne hac censura notandus esset ille, qui particulares decisiones particularium casuum *leges* ac *decreta generalia* esse docet; ac, sub aspectu libertatis humanae protegendae, finem primarium, ob quem sacramentum matrimonii institutum fuit, non protegit?

Ut finem imponamus huic nostro articulo, breviter ac synthetice, notamus: animadversiones omnes cl. opponentis, plus minusve, supponunt *coitum maritalem*, seu *copulam coniugalem perfectam*, esse possibilem simul cum impotentia *radicali* generandi, quod est falsum; supponunt deinde finem secundarium matrimonii, scilicet sedationem concupiscentiae, obtineri posse etiamsi finis primarius, seu generatio, sit *physice* et *per se* impossibilis, quod est falsum. Recolantur haec duo ac serio perpendantur.

Interea memores illius: In necessariis unitas, in dubiis libertas, in omnibus caritas; dum gaudio videmus sententiam, quam nos defendimus, gradatim defendi etiam a summae notae Theologis, ut recenter accidisse nunc conspicimus clariss. quoque Palmieri, qui illam in ultima editione Gury exponit ac tuetur; gratias quamplurimas agimus adm. Rev. P. Hild, qui animadversionibus suis opportunitatem nobis praebuit nonnulla declarandi, quae lucem aliquam afferre valent, ut omnes videant ac admittant syllogismum nostrum: *Ex Ecclesia* invalide contrahit matrimonium qui impedimento impotentiae laborat; atqui ex *Physiologia* mulier carens ovariis laborat impedimento impotentiae; ergo mulier sine ovariis matrimonium valide contrahere non potest.

N. Casacca, O.S.A.

Villanova College, Pa.

WORK AND SCOPE OF THE PROPAGANDA[1]

AT all times the Catholic Church has endeavored to fulfil the command of her Divine Founder: "Go and teach all nations. . . . Preach the Gospel to every creature . . . ;" still there are certain periods in her history when her apostolic mission manifests itself more strikingly. Such is the sixteenth century. The discovery of America and the finding of a new route to India and the Far East opened untilled fields to the apostolate, while the defection of several European nations from the faith of their ancestors gave new impetus to missionary spirit: the losses caused by the so-called Reformation were to be compensated by the reception of other peoples into the true fold of Christ. The large increase in the number of missionaries who in the sixteenth century implanted the faith in new countries made it necessary to create a special department in the administration of the Church at Rome, and this was done by Gregory XV, who, in 1622, established the "Congregatio De Propaganda Fide," or Congregation of the Propagation of the Faith, commonly called the Propaganda. The object of this sketch is to give an outline of its origin, aim and methods, of the extent of its jurisdiction, of its resources in men and money, etc.

THE AIM, ORGANIZATION AND PERSONNEL OF THE PROPAGANDA.

The pontifical document which created the Propaganda indicated clearly its functions: "The prelates who will compose it will consult about, take cognizance of and treat all and every kind of business which pertains to the propagation of the faith in the whole world . . . they shall superintend all missions for the preaching of the Gospel. . . ." The Pope then determined the personnel and laid down the rules governing this new department; they have practically remained unchanged. The Congregation of the Propaganda is composed of about twenty-eight Cardinals; over one-half of them reside in Rome, the others are Bishops of various countries, like Cardinal Gibbons, Archbishop of Baltimore; Cardinal Vaughan, Archbishop of Westminster, etc. It is, of course, clear

[1] For the principal data contained in this sketch the author has consulted *Le Vatican*, par Goyau. Paris: Pératé et Fabre. 1895.

that the Cardinals who do not reside in Rome can take but a very indirect part in the work of the Propaganda. They are honorary rather than active members. However, when they happen to be in Rome they do not fail to attend the meetings and make use of their functions. One of the resident Cardinals is prefect or president; at present Cardinal Gotti, recently appointed. Besides the Cardinals, there are thirty-eight consultors, of whom over one-third belong to various religious orders, besides several assessors, interpreters, archivists, etc. The various business matters pertaining or submitted to the Congregation are divided among those officials and decided according to their importance in the ordinary weekly meetings or in the solemn congregation held once a month, at which all the Cardinals are present. In those meetings the questions under consideration are examined and discussed after the reading of the reports prepared by consultors, assessors, etc., and a decision is taken by a majority vote of the Cardinals. Those decisions may concern the spiritual or the temporal welfare of the missions, the creation of new vicariates, the appointment of Vicars, Bishops and other chiefs of missions, the settlement of difficulties, etc. In all cases the decisions are referred to the Holy Father for final approval.

Extent of the Jurisdiction of the Propaganda.

For government and administration purposes Rome divides the world in two very unequal parts. The smaller comprises the Catholic countries; the other, immense as far as territory is concerned, the missionary countries. Let us remark at once, lest those appellations give a wrong impression, that the title of *Catholic* given to a country does not necessarily imply that all its inhabitants are Catholics, or that there is no need of missionary work among them; but it implies that the Catholic Faith has been preached and implanted all over the country, and that in spite of the ravages of modern infidelity the great majority of the people profess no other religion, though there may be a certain number who do not live up to its teachings. In Catholic countries the laws of the Church—those laws especially which regulate the relations between people and pastors, priests and bishops, local churches with the head of the Church, etc.—apply in full, unless

they have been modified by special concordats between the Pope and the temporal powers. The religious affairs of those countries are attended to according to their nature by the various Congregations or departments of the Church's administration at Rome, which may be compared to the various departments of our civil administration at Washington.

The missionary countries are those in which heresy, schism or infidelity prevails. Although the faith has perhaps been preached there for centuries, it has made as yet little progress—*e. g.*, in China, Japan, etc. Or again, those countries which were Catholic at certain periods of their history but abandoned the fold, like England, Scotland, parts of Germany, etc.; or having been invaded by Mohammedanism, the number of Catholics has dwindled into insignificance, as in Turkey,[2] Asia Minor, etc. Such countries the Holy See regards as special mission fields and usually applies to them a distinct form of government. Those young churches or those new Catholic settlements would not be able to carry out in full all the requirements of the ordinary church legislation; separate laws are enacted for them, which are specially adapted to their condition, and they are placed under the jurisdiction of the Propaganda, which will supply for them all the other departments of the ecclesiastical administration.

Keeping these distinctions in mind, let us now enumerate the countries placed under the jurisdiction of the Propaganda as missionary fields:

In North America: The United States, Canada, Lower California, Honduras, the West Indies, excepting the Islands of Cuba, Porto Rico, Hayti, Guadaloupe, and Martinique.

In South America: Guiana, Patagonia, three Prefectures Apostolic in Peru.

In Europe: Great Britain and Ireland, Norway, Sweden, Denmark, Holland, Luxembourg, parts of Germany and Switzerland, Greece, Crete, and all the Balkan States.

In Africa: The whole continent, excepting Algeria, Carthage, Ceuta, Angola, and the Canaries and Bourbon Islands.

[2] It may happen that for very special reasons, mostly political, certain countries are not counted as missionary, in the canonical sense of the word, though almost entirely non-Catholic—*e. g.*, Russia; while in others the missionary form of government is applied, when the great majority of the people are Catholics—*e. g.*, Ireland.

In Asia: The whole continent, excepting Siberia and the See of Goa in India.

In Oceanica: All except the Philippines.

How the Propaganda Carries out its Conquests.

The Pope being the Vicar of Christ on earth has the whole world under his jurisdiction, which he can exercise at any time in any church matter. Practically, however, the world has been parcelled out into dioceses, vicariates, and prefectures entrusted to the care of Bishops, Vicars, and Prefects Apostolic. And although it may be said that there is no portion of the globe which does not come under the jurisdiction of some of those church officials, still in many cases that jurisdiction is merely theoretical, owing to the immensity of territory it embraces or to the fact that it is as yet void of churches and faithful.

In some of those unexplored quarters, or in a region where infidelity or heresy reigns, two or three missionaries may be sent to open a Christian settlement. The Propaganda gives a name to that newly-born church and assigns a place to it in its catalogue; it is called a mission; if it develops it is made a prefecture apostolic, and territorial limits are assigned to it and it acquires a legal existence. After a time, the number of converts growing, churches having been built and congregations formed, the prefecture is transformed into a vicariate apostolic. Prefectures and vicariates apostolic may be well compared to our territories, which have not full autonomy and do not enjoy all the rights and privileges conferred by statehood. Later on, the vicariate having extended its conquests will be divided into new centres of missions, over which new chiefs will be appointed. Thus did the Apostles, founding missions wherever they went, which were divided when the number of faithful called for a new administration.

A striking example of that process may be seen in what took place in central and southern Africa during the nineteenth century. In 1835 those regions were almost unexplored. Gregory XVI founded three vicariates apostolic; under Pius IX those three vicariates were divided into thirteen vicariates or prefectures; the

same process continued under Leo XIII in proportion to the progress of Catholicism, and to-day there are in that portion of Africa twenty-four vicariates, eighteen prefectures and four missions. The same process was carried out and is still being carried out in America, Asia, and Oceanica.

How the Propaganda Organizes its Conquests—Vicariates—Prefectures—Apostolic Delegations—Titular Bishops.

There are only two degrees in the hierarchy established by the Propaganda: the prefects and the vicars. The prefect is a simple priest who has not received the episcopal character; he may have been granted, however, permission to give the Sacrament of Confirmation and the minor orders. In administration matters he exercises the powers of a bishop, dividing missions, appointing pastors over them, etc. Such is, for example, the prefect apostolic of Alaska, a Jesuit father who resides at Juneau. Vicars apostolic, since the seventeenth century, received episcopal consecration. That custom was introduced by the founders of the seminary for foreign missions at Paris—Bishop Pallu and Bishop de Lamothe Lambert. They asked Pope Alexander VII that the chief of missions be given the episcopal dignity.

To preserve the Church's custom of giving to a bishop the title of an established see, Mgr. Pallu was appointed Bishop of Hieropolis, Mgr. Lambert, Bishop of Beyrouth. These were ancient bishoprics no longer actually administered, and therefore called titular in opposition to the residential sees. There are over three hundred titular bishoprics, which take their names from cities in Asia, Europe, and Africa, once residences of a bishop. Islamism or the invasions of the barbarians swept away the fold, the city has perhaps disappeared or has become a hamlet, but the Church has maintained the episcopal title; she does not consider her eviction as final; she hopes that one day those titular sees will become anew the residences of bishops. She can wait, having promises of immortality; and in the meantime she gives the titles of those ancient cities to certain church officials whose functions demand that they have episcopal powers; such are the coadjutor and auxiliary bishops who need the power of confirming, ordaining, and the like,

and who nevertheless have not the charge of a diocese; such are also the vicars apostolic who have no residential see and are merely the delegates of the Propaganda in whose name they exercise their ministry and to whom they are, like the Prefects, directly responsible. They were for a long time called Bishops "*in partibus infidelium*," among the infidels; but certain countries where are found some of those sees, for example Greece, were displeased at being called region of infidels, and so Leo XIII, in 1882, decided that those bishops would henceforth be called titular bishops. Titular Bishop of Messene is, for example, the title of the present Vicar Apostolic of North Carolina.

Besides appointing Prefects and Vicars, the Propaganda sends also Apostolic Delegates; there are at present ten in the following countries: Turkey in Europe, Egypt and Arabia, Greece, Oriental India, Mesopotamia, Kurdistan and Armenia Minor, Persia, Syria, the United States, Canada, the Philippines.

Those delegates who are titular Archbishops represent the Propaganda and are placed over Prefects and Vicars Apostolic, having limited jurisdiction. The Delegates in the United States, Canada and Oriental India are placed over archbishoprics and bishoprics properly established. In all cases their powers are confined to spiritual matters; they do not represent the Holy See at the Courts or capitals of foreign countries as do the Papal Nuncios in the Catholic countries of Europe and South America.

The Episcopal Hierarchy Substituted for the Missionary Form of Government.

It is not accurate to say that the Propaganda extends its jurisdiction over missionary countries only; it controls also churches which have passed that stage of formation and where archbishoprics and bishoprics have been substituted for the prefectures and the vicariates; as, for example, the United States of America. In the early colonial days the few Catholic missions were placed under vicars apostolic of England, and in 1688 under the vicar of London. A century later the clergy of the United States solicited a superior from the Pope, and Dr. Carroll was appointed prefect apostolic in 1784. It was the intention of His Holiness to make him vicar apostolic at the earliest possible moment; but, owing to

circumstances, this was not done, and in 1789, Pius VI, having created the see of Baltimore, Dr. Carroll was appointed to it; twenty years later Pius VII made him an Archbishop, and from his diocese, which then comprised the thirteen original States, created four episcopal sees: New York, Boston, Philadelphia, and Bardstown, now Louisville, in Kentucky; the division and subdivision has been continued ever since.

Theoretically a country in which a hierarchy is constituted of archbishops and bishops ceases to be under the jurisdiction of the Propaganda and falls under the general form of Church administration. Having attained the age of manhood it is, so to speak, emancipated, just as a Territory may be said to be emancipated when admitted to take place among States of the Union. But owing to the many privileges granted to the subjects of the Propaganda and the greater facilities of business transactions with Rome through that Congregation, the privilege was granted to the American Church to remain under its tutelage; the same was done for England, Scotland, Holland, Australia, etc., when the hierarchy was reëstablished in those countries during the nineteenth century.

From this it follows that the Propaganda rules over a great variety of countries; it includes the negroes of Central Africa and the faithful of London; the missions of Patagonia and the flourishing dioceses of New York and Chicago; the newly born Christian settlement and the fully grown church.

How Prefects, Vicars Apostolic, Etc., are Appointed.

Prefects apostolic are appointed directly by the Propaganda. Vicars are appointed with more formality. The chiefs of missions are required to send frequent reports of their work to the Congregation; among the questions put to them there is one on the qualifications of the missionaries who might be named vicars apostolic in case of vacancy or the creation of a new vicariate. When this occurs, a choice is made from the names proposed, a titular see is selected and the proceedings are submitted to the Pope for approval. Residential Bishops of the countries subject to the Propaganda are appointed on the presentation made by the clergy or a portion of the clergy of the vacant diocese and the Bishops

of the province. This mode of presentation is different for the different countries. It is as follows, according to the rules enacted in 1884 by the Third Council of Baltimore, for the American Church: When an episcopal see is vacant either by the death or the transfer of its incumbent, a list of three names (*terna*) is made by the majority vote of the consultors and the irremovable rectors of the diocese. This list is submitted to the Bishops of the province, who may subscribe to it or not. In case they do not, they make up in the same manner another list of three candidates, and both lists, which contain a detailed description of the relative merits of the men chosen, are sent to the Propaganda; there they are carefully examined and discussed by the Cardinals, and the election is made in a solemn meeting of the Congregation. It may happen, however, and in fact does happen, though rarely, that for special reasons a candidate is appointed whose name was on neither list; the Propaganda exercising supreme jurisdiction, and the bishops and priests having only a restricted right of presentation.

The Colleges of the Propaganda.

Under Urban VIII, J. B. Vives, a Spanish prelate, offered to the Propaganda a palace he possessed in Rome located on the "Piazza di Spagna." In this palace the Pope established a college "or apostolic seminary under the Patronage of SS. Peter and Paul, and the name of Urban, for the propagation and the defence of the Catholic faith." He assigned to it a certain income supplemented by the donations of some rich ecclesiastics. It is to-day under the direction of secular priests and the supervision of the Cardinal Prefect of the Propaganda. The students, who number about one hundred and twenty-five, come from all parts of the world, but principally from the Orient; as many as twenty-five of thirty nationalities being at times represented.

The students of the college of the Propaganda take a solemn oath to spend their lives under the supreme direction of the Congregation, in the missions where they may be sent. There they will work unsparingly and forever for the diffusion of the Gospel and the salvation of souls. They will send to Rome a report of their work and the progress of religion in their district every year,

if they work in Europe, otherwise every other year. They will not enter a religious order or congregation without the special permission of the Holy See.

Since Alexander VII (1660) all the Propagandists, as they are called, take that oath; the Congregation which has educated them remains, so to speak, the ruling power of their lives: they must not forget their Alma Mater and she will continue to extend over them her authority and protection. The founder of the College, Urban VIII, had given the following programme to its students: "They must expose themselves to death and martyrdom, if need be, for the defence, progress and propagation of the Faith, and this to the end of time, until the number of the elect be complete and there be one fold and one shepherd!" To work until all living beings have entered the true fold of Christ, such is the aim of the Urban College! To shed their blood, if need be, to attain that end, such is the sublime means proposed to its students; and the red sash which they wear on their black cassocks is the symbol of the violent death which may be in store for them and which many have met.

Besides the Urban College there are in Rome and outside of Rome a number of other colleges preparing missionaries for the service of the Propaganda. They may be divided into two classes: In some, young men born in countries where heresy or infidelity is prevalent are preparing to evangelize their own countrymen; in others, clerics mostly born in Catholic countries prepare for the preaching of the Gospel to nations foreign to them by race and language.

Among the latter the most important is doubtless the seminary for Foreign Missions established in Paris in 1663. Since that date it has given about 80 names to the martyrology and it contains at present over 300 students, while the number of its missionaries at work in Asia is more than 1,200, under the leadership of 34 Vicars Apostolic. Other establishments of the same nature are: The Seminary for African Missions at Lyons; the Seminary for Foreign Missions at Milan; the Roman Seminary of SS. Peter and Paul; the Seminary of Verona for missions among the negroes; the College Brignole Sale at Genoa; St. Joseph's Seminary at Mill Hill, England; the German-Dutch

Seminary for Foreign Missions at Steyl, Holland; the American College at Louvain; the Belgian Seminary for Foreign Missions at Scheutlez-Bruxelles; the English College at Bruges, etc. These colleges were not founded by the Propaganda, they are due to private initiative; but the very nature of their aim placed them under the direction of this Congregation.

Among the colleges preparing native missionaries, several are in Rome and owe their origin to the Popes. Such is the English College established in Rome by Gregory XIII in 1579; the students are all English-born and will propagate the Faith in England. Clement VIII founded the Scotch College in 1600, while the Irish College was established under Urban VIII. Two other Irish colleges were later on opened in Rome, one by the Franciscans and the other by the Augustinians. Pius IX founded the American College for the United States, and Leo XIII the Canadian and Dutch Colleges, as well as the Armenian, Maronite, and Greek Ruthene Colleges in which young men are educated according to their own rites. The students of these Colleges generally follow the course of studies given in the College of the Propaganda, while a clerical training adapted to the needs of their future ministry is given them in their own houses.

Outside of Rome we find a number of colleges preparing clerics for missionary work in their own country to which they are bound to return; for instance, the English colleges of Valladolid and Lisbon, the Scotch college at Valladolid, the Irish college at Paris, etc. Let us not forget the important establishment of Poulo-Pinang (in the Straits of Malacca, off the Siamese coast) kept by the priests of the foreign missions of Paris, in which Chinese, Indo-Chinese, and Burmans are educated for the priesthood. Finally, in many vicariates of China, Japan, India, etc., there are seminaries for the natives who have received the divine call to a missionary life.

We do not mention the *local* colleges or seminaries preparing young men either for *general* home missionary work, such as the various seminaries in the United States, England, etc., or for *special* missionary labors, such as St. Joseph's Seminary at Baltimore for negro missions, and the house just opened at Washington for missions to non-Catholics.

The formation of a native clergy for the evangelization of heathen lands and non-Catholic countries has always been the wish of the Propaganda. St. Francis Xavier in the sixteenth century recommended it to be done as soon as possible, and Leo XIII wrote in his letter to the Hindus (1893): "The zeal of missionaries come from Europe meets with many obstacles, the greatest being the ignorance of a language, sometimes most difficult to master, and new customs and habits to which one is not used even after many years. This is why the European clergy is looked upon as totally foreign in India. It is evident that native priests will inspire greater confidence and their work will be followed by more lasting results."

Thus while the first kind of colleges for foreign missions render valuable services by giving priests to certain countries where no vocations could as yet be found, the Church desires the establishment of seminaries where natives are prepared to preach and minister in their own country. Native clergy alone will strengthen the position of the Catholic Church. That was the idea of Urban VIII when he founded the College of the Propaganda.

From the foregoing it must not be understood that the priests trained in the colleges enumerated are the only ones at work in the missions. In fact they are only a small portion of the large army of Catholic missionaries, the majority of whom belongs to the various religious orders. It is the invariable rule of the Church to entrust to the care of every religious order, congregation or society a portion of the world to be evangelized. For example, the Franciscan, the Dominican, the Jesuit, the Lazarist, and other orders have some of their members at work in China and elsewhere, and so it is with all other religious congregations.

Now these missionaries have been trained in houses of their orders and were designated by their own superiors for an apostolic life. Once on the missionary field they continue to follow the rule of that order or society as far as it is compatible with their labors, and are subject to their superiors in all that concerns their individual life. But in regard to the administration of the mission they follow the rules given them by the Propaganda; the Prefects, Vicars Apostolic and even Bishops are appointed in the manner described above, and send their reports to the Congregation, on which they are dependent as well as secular missionaries.

The Printing Establishment of the Propaganda.

The Congregation of the Propaganda was hardly founded when it felt the need of having a printing-press attached to it so as to furnish students in the college and missionaries at large with books in various languages. It was established in 1626; types of all kinds, especially of Oriental languages, were procured at great cost, and as early as 1639 the Propaganda was able to issue a catalogue of its publications. The printing-press of the Propaganda has been under the direction of scholars of great renown, among others Ruggieri and Amaduzzi in the eighteenth century. It is the latter who introduced in Europe certain alphabets of the Far East hitherto unknown. At the time of the French revolution the Propaganda's press lost many of its treasures, but the losses were repaired under Gregory XVI, and in 1846 it was able to print books in 57 languages, viz., 27 European, 22 Asiatic, 5 African, and 3 American. Under Pius IX liturgical books of the Oriental rites were printed under the supervision of the learned Cardinal Pitra. The most important works published under Leo XIII are the great edition of the works of St. Thomas Aquinas and the Greek Bible from the Codex Vaticanus.

Every three years a Missionary Directory is issued under the title of "*Missiones Catholicae Cura S. Congregationis de Propaganda Fide descriptae.*" It gives a complete and authentic account and description of all the Dioceses, Vicariates, Prefectures and Missions under the jurisdiction of the Congregation.

We find in the last catalogue of the press of the Propaganda about 700 different works, mostly religious, or various editions of the same, representing 38 languages. Books may be found there in Ethiopian, Persian, Arabic, Turkish, Chaldaic, Syrian, Coptic, Sanscrit, Japanese, Chinese, Madagascan, etc., besides the European languages. The Propaganda has therefore well deserved the gratitude not only of Christian philanthropists but of philologists as well.

Together with an important library the Congregation possesses an interesting collection of curios and souvenirs brought by missionaries from all parts of the world. Let us mention among others the famous map of the newly discovered world on which

Pope Alexander VI drew a line of demarcation to settle the disputes between Spain and Portugal. What lay to the west was to belong to Spain, and what to the east to Portugal.

The Finances of the Propaganda.

The needs of the Propaganda are immense, like its ambition, which is to convert the whole world. Gregory XV began to provide for them by assigning to it the revenue of the cardinalitial rings. Each newly created Cardinal receives from the Pope in Consistory a ring which has been furnished by the Propaganda, and in exchange for this he is expected to make an offering to that Congregation. The sum was fixed at one thousand dollars by Gregory XV, but reduced to six hundred by Pius VIII; it continues to be paid.

Throughout the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries numerous donations were made to the Propaganda by Popes, rich ecclesiastics, and pious laymen, so much that it was found necessary to give the Cardinal Prefect, who attends to the spiritual affairs of the Congregation, an assistant Cardinal, called "Prefetto di economia," who watches over its temporal affairs. That office is filled at present by Cardinal Vincenzo Vannutelli.

The invasion of the Roman States by the French troops and the burden imposed on the Pope by Napoleon I after the treaty of Tolentino greatly injured the Propaganda's finances. After his return to Rome, Pius VII began to make up for the losses by assigning to it the revenues of the vacant Italian episcopal sees; but the income thus derived is small, uncertain, and irregularly paid. On the occasion of his Jubilee, in 1888, Leo XIII exempted them from that tax for twenty years.

At present the annual revenues of the Propaganda amount to about $135,000, a sum hardly sufficient to support its numerous personnel, its college, its university, its printing establishment, etc., without mentioning the cost of maintaining certain missions, mostly in the East, of which it has taken special charge.

Formerly the Propaganda could help missions not merely with its revenues, but also by alienating parts of its capital, when unexpected misfortunes demanded extraordinary help. This cannot be done any longer, owing to the action of the Italian Government.

In 1873 the Italian Parliament enacted a law according to which all ecclesiastical properties in the former Papal States were to be converted into Government bonds. The enforcement of the decree in regard to the Propaganda's properties was postponed by Victor Emmanuel, who feared a scandalous lawsuit. But in 1880, under his successor, they were placed for sale by order of a royal commissary; the Congregation made opposition, but was condemned by the Tribunal and the Court of Appeal of Rome. The Court of Cassation, however, reversed the sentence, and the suit was begun anew at the instance of the Government before the Court of Ancona. The Propaganda was condemned again, and this time the judgment was ratified by the Court of Cassation, which contradicted thereby its former decision. Regardless of their international character, origin and aim, the properties of the Propaganda were to be sold and the proceeds invested in Italian bonds. Of course, the Pope and the Prefect of the Propaganda entered a solemn protest; a long and public controversy was begun between Cardinal Jacobini and the Italian Minister, Mancini, the first denouncing the injustice and the dangers of the action, the second asserting its perfect legality and harmlessness. Protests poured in from all parts of the Catholic world, but they had the effect of those against the Armenian massacres or the crushing of the Boers; the decision of the Court was carried out. On this occasion Mr. Ruggero Bonghi, the very author of the Law of Guarantees, wrote: "To paralyze the action of the Propaganda will benefit neither mankind, nor civilization, nor Italy."

The Propaganda therefore no longer disposes of its capital, and its revenues are subordinate to the credit of the Italian Government. In 1894 certain manipulation of the Italian finances brought about by the dire distress of the kingdom, diminished its income by $8000, and a bankruptcy of the Bank of Italy, which is by no means improbable, would mean the bankruptcy of the Propaganda. Financially speaking the Congregation is in the hands of the Government.

The first care of the Congregation thus spoliated was to make provision for the free disposition of future donations. In 1884 Cardinal Simeoni named eleven European cities—naturally all outside of Italy—three cities in Asia, one in Africa, five in America

and one in Australia, where a Papal nuncio or a bishop or a vicar apostolic would act as the agent of the Propaganda in receiving and investing donations made for its work.

It is needless to say that Catholic missionaries who cannot gain their support from the people for whom they work, must not look to the Propaganda for much assistance. They are helped by several societies founded during the last century to organize and give form to the charity of the faithful in behalf of missions. The most important of these societies is the International Society for the Propagation of the Faith, founded in Lyons in 1822. It is established all over the world, and furnishes the principal support for the Catholic Apostolate. Since its foundation it has collected over sixty-seven millions of dollars, of which nearly six millions were distributed to missions in the United States. Other societies, auxiliaries of the Progaganda for the obtaining of funds for the missions, are: The Association of the Holy Childhood and the Association of Oriental Schools founded in France; the Society of St. Francis Xavier, in Aix-la-Chapelle; the Association of St. Peter Claver, in Salzburg; the Leopoldsverein, in Austria; the Ludwigsmissionverein, in Bavaria; not to mention several "anti-slavery," "Holy Land" associations and societies for home missions. We must add also that nearly all religious orders and congregations in charge of missions publish a bulletin giving an account of their labors and through which they solicit the charity of the faithful. None the less, if we were to combine the results of all these sources we would see that what Catholics do for foreign missions is little compared to what is being done by Protestants for the same object. Our missionaries have to rely on sacrifice and the blessing of God, and the success of their work compared with the failure of Protestant missions shows that personal zeal is more powerful than gold for the conversion of the infidels.

The Propaganda and the Orient.

There are two commissions connected with the Propaganda to help it in its manifold labors: one to examine the reports sent from time to time by bishops, vicars, and prefects, on the condition of the missions under their care; the other, created by Pius

IX, in 1862, attends to the affairs of the Oriental Rites. A sketch of the latter may be of interest.

By rite we understand the liturgical rules for the administration of the Sacraments, the celebration of the Mass, and the other external forms of worship. In the Orient the vernacular is used in the celebration of the liturgy instead of the Latin. The Oriental ceremonies also differ from ours. Hence our rite is called the Latin rite in distinction from the various Oriental rites.

The Christians of the East who do not follow the Latin rite may be divided into three classes: the heretic, the schismatic, and the United Christians.

1. In the fifth century the errors of Nestorius were adopted in Eastern Syria at about the same time as those of Eutyches in Western Syria. The Eutychians or Monophysites split into numerous sects which took the names of Armenian, Jacobite, Coptic, and Abyssinian. For thirteen centuries those churches have been isolated from the centre of unity, their priests are ignorant, and their articles of belief unsettled. They have retained almost unchanged the rites followed at the time of their separation.

2. The Greek schismatics or separated brethren form the great majority of the Oriental Christians. Excepting Russia, they acknowledge the primacy of the Greek Patriarch of Constantinople. Up to the eleventh century they were in communion with Rome, though several attempts at separation had already been made. At the time of separation their dogmas were the same as ours. Since then and while those dogmas have undergone a natural process of development in the Roman Church they have remained asleep among the Greeks. In spite of differences of belief, more important to-day than they were at the beginning of the schism, the Greeks are not called heretics; they would readily be admitted into the fold if they would sign an act of union with the Holy See. Greece, Roumania, Bulgaria, many Christian settlements in the Turkish Empire, and finally Russia are schismatic. They follow the Greek rite.

3. The Oriental Christians in communion with the Holy See: The Directory of the Propaganda enumerates twelve rites of United Christians—

(1) The Greek rite pure, followed by a few hundred Christians at Constantinople, at Cesarea in Cappadocia and at Margara in Thracia.

(2) The Greek Bulgarian rite, followed by 30,000 Catholics in Macedonia and 3,000 in Thracia.

(3) The Coptic rite numbers 10,000 followers in Egypt.

(4) The Ethiopian rite has 25,000 in Abyssinia.

(5) The Syrian rite is practised by 200,000 Catholics on the coast of Malabar in India.

(6) The Greek Roumanian rite has about one million of adherents in Transylvania (Hungary).

(7) The Greek Ruthenian rite is followed by 3,500,000 Catholics in Galicia, Croatia and Northern Hungary. There are 60,000 Ruthenians in the Province of St. Boniface, Canada.

(8) The Greek Melchite rite is observed by 100,000 Syrians, while

(9) Of the same nation 22,000 Catholics have preserved the pure Syrian rite.

(10) The Syro-Chaldaic rite has about 50,000 followers in Mesopotamia, Persia and Kurdistan.

(11) The Syro-Maronite rite is followed by 300,000 Catholics in Syria and the Island of Cyprus.

(12) Finally the Armenian rite is observed in Constantinople, Alexandria, Asia Minor, Mesopotamia, Persia, in some parts of Hungary and Russia by about 100,000 Catholics.

The emigration which has brought to the American shores peoples from all parts of the world has introduced in our midst Catholics belonging to some of the rites just mentioned. The Syro-Maronite, Greek, Melchite, Ruthenian, Armenian rites, etc., are represented in the United States, and as soon as their number justifies it the Propaganda sends priests of their nationalities to minister to them; and in several dioceses, New York, Boston, Scranton, Pittsburg for example, they have churches where their rites are carried out. Needless to say that in matters of ecclesiastical administration both priests and faithful are under the jurisdiction of the Bishop of the diocese. Such is not the case in the East. There, ecclesiastical jurisdiction is personal instead of territorial as with us. Hence it may happen that the same city

will be the episcopal see of various Bishops belonging to different rites, each one governing his own clergy and people. For instance, Beyrouth in Syria is the residence of Bishops of the Syrian, Syro-Maronite and Greek Melchite rites.

The differences of rites affect in no way the articles of Faith, which are one and the same in the Latin Church and the Oriental Churches in communion with the Holy See. The doctrine of Rome on that point has never changed; it was always admitted that variety of rite is no breach of unity. In the early ages of Christianity the vernacular was used in the celebration of the sacred mysteries and the ceremonies were primitive and local. Rome herself used at first the Greek language in her ritual, and it is only in the fourth century that the Latin was substituted for it in the West, while there was a tendency toward uniformity in the ceremonial. In the East, on the contrary, they retained the old forms of worship, some dating from the second century, such as the Coptic, whilst others have a much more recent origin.

The rite is for Oriental Christians not only an element and a symbol, but also a proof and a guarantee of their nationality; hence their attachment to it, and the reason why the Popes have protected those rites with the greatest care. Priests and clerics are forbidden to pass from an Oriental to the Latin rite, and the missionaries sent by the Propaganda among the Greek schismatics, while exhorting them to return to unity must not advise them to abandon their rites, of which, on the contrary, they must be guaranteed the free exercise.

Living as they do among schismatics, heretics and Mohammedans, the Catholics of Oriental rites were naturally placed under the jurisdiction of the Propaganda when it was founded, but the need was soon felt of dividing the work, and as early as the time of Urban VIII commissions were appointed on "Questions of the Orientals" and on "Correcting the Liturgical Oriental Books," especially the Greek Missal, also called the Eucologe. In 1862, Pius IX created a special Congregation of the Propaganda for the Affairs of the Oriental Rite—"Congregatio de Propaganda Fide pro negotiis Ritus Orientalis." This Congregation is presided over by the Prefect of the Propaganda and is composed of a number of Cardinals (twelve at present) of the same Congregation,

but it has its own secretary, consultors and officials. Each Cardinal has in charge one of the Oriental churches with the affairs of which he is particularly acquainted.

In spite of the efforts of Pius IX and Leo XIII to bring back to unity the schismatics of the East, the results have been poor. Indeed in 1870 the imprudence of certain Latin missionaries, who thought the unification of rites the necessary complement of Roman centralization, caused several defections among some of the united churches; they made their submission a few years ago. Leo XIII continues to show his paternal solicitude for the separated brethren, but their coming back to the fold is still a far distant ideal; in some countries, Russia for instance, missionary work is made impossible by the Government, in others it consists mostly in raising up the united churches and infusing some life into them.

Such is the Propaganda, which may be called the department of foreign missions of the Church. Its constitution recalls to mind that of the Church herself, having that twofold element of absolute centralization in government and perfect independence in the means adopted to attain the aim in view, the propagation of the Faith. Whilst the chiefs of missions, be they simple prefects or archbishops, remain directly responsible to the Congregation, to which they must give an account of their work, they are almost supreme in the direction of their missions, within of course the limits of ecclesiastical law. It is left to them to look for the helpers they need, priests, brothers or sisters, to direct them and watch over them, to see that charitable and educational establishments are founded and the means necessary to carry out the work obtained.

In conclusion, it may be asked, what is the number of Catholic missionaries? If the question were, what is the number of bishops, priests and religious under the jurisdiction of the Propaganda? we might answer by simply computing the figures given in the last edition of the Propaganda's Directory.[3] But it seems to us that those figures would convey a false impression, from the fact that although certain countries, like the United States, England, Ireland, etc., have remained subject to that Con-

[3] *Missiones Catholicae*, Junii 1901.

gregation, for various reasons in most places the actual missionary stage has passed. It is clear, for example, that priests working among people of their own race in the well organized parishes of Boston or Philadelphia can hardly be called *missionaries*, if we are to take the word in its popular sense, of one who has left his country to go to distant regions and especially heathen lands for the purpose of spreading the Faith.

On the other hand, the statistics of religious orders and missionary societies are difficult to obtain and generally unsatisfactory. Several writers who have studied the question think it a conservative estimate to place the number of Catholic missionaries properly speaking at 15,000 priests, 5,000 teaching brothers, and 45,000 sisters. Assuredly it is an astonishing number, but when we consider the work still to be done, we are prompted to address to all those who have at heart the diffusion of the Christian Faith the words of our Lord: "The harvest indeed is great, but the laborers are few. Pray ye therefore the Lord of the harvest that He send laborers into His harvest." (Luke 10: 2.)

J. FRERI, D.C.L.,
Director of the Society for the Propagation of the Faith.

Baltimore, Md.

THE APOSTOLIC AUTHORSHIP OF THE SYMBOL.*

II.

WHAT the living Church of God handed down from generation to generation of believers as the symbol of the Apostles was, with slight variations affecting neither its substance nor its essential meaning, the Baptismal Creed of Christendom in the fourth and fifth centuries. St. Leo the Great, who became Pope in 440 A. D., writing to the monks of Palestine, refers to it as "the Symbol of salvation which you recited before many witnesses when you received baptism.[1]" And again, in a letter against Eutyches, addressed to Flavian, Bishop of Constantinople, he says, speaking of that arch-heretic: "What

* See January number, pp. 1–17.

[1] Migne, tom. 54, col. 1068.

instruction has he got from the sacred pages of the New Testament and the Old, when he does not understand even the elements of the Symbol? Of the Symbol which is on the lips of all candidates for baptism throughout the whole world, that old man has not yet grasped the meaning.[2]" This period, then, in which it is matter of historical record that the Symbol was the Baptismal Creed of the Universal Church, is the true starting-point in the quest of its origin.

But before setting out on this quest, we shall do well to consider what our real objective is, and by what way we are to reach it. At the period we have taken for our starting-point, the Church of Rome has its Symbol, and the Church of Aquileia has its Symbol, and the Church of Antioch has its Symbol, and the Church of Alexandria has its Symbol. In short, the principal Churches throughout the world have each its own Symbol. Are we to seek a diverse origin for each of these Symbols, or for all a common origin? We must find one origin for all. And why? Because, after all, in spite of variations in the form and wording, the Symbol is one—one in its scope, one in its structure, one in type, one in all its essential elements. So little does St. Leo regard these variations in the form of the Symbol as affecting its unity that he affirms it to be, not only one in all the Churches, but "unchangeable" as well.[3] From the beginning there is "one Lord, one Faith, one Baptism, one God and Father of all." The Faith of the One Fold is one from the first: therefore, is the Symbol or Confession of the Faith one. The one Church can have but one Creed—this needs not even to be pointed out to those that are of the household of the faith. As for those that are without, they have only to glance into the writings of the early Fathers to find how accordant their testimony is on this point. St. Leo does but echo the words of Christian Antiquity, as we shall have occasion to point out presently, when he speaks of the one and unchangeable Confession of Faith.

The conclusion thus reached on logical, theological, and historical grounds regarding the unity of the Symbol, is borne out also by analogical considerations. In living organisms unity of

[2] *Ib.*, col. 757.
[3] *Ib.*, col. 986.

structure implies unity of type, and unity of type involves unity of origin. Organisms sprung from the same source will vary; variation, indeed, is the very condition of their growth; but the unity of structure and type that is discernible in them will ever attest their common origin. So it is with the formularies of the Faith in the fourth and fifth centuries. Despite the variations that are visible on the surface, it is but an unpractised eye that will not detect the underlying sameness of type and lineament which bespeaks their common authorship. Even those who deny the Apostolic origin of the Symbol realize that there is an archetype to which all variant forms must be traced, though they are at a loss to know what that is, or where they are to look for it. Dr. Kattenbusch identifies it with the Old Roman Creed; Dr. Loofs follows the lead of Caspari in tracing it to the Johannine circle in Asia Minor.[4] Strange that none of these critics has been led to trace the archetypal Symbol to the Mother Church of Jerusalem. The cradle of Christianity would have been a not unlikely place to look for the aboriginal Creed of Christianity. And it might not have proved, it should seem, a bad "working hypothesis," that the men whom Christ Himself commissioned in Jerusalem to "teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost," had, in virtue of that commission and in accordance with it, drawn up the Formula of Faith which should serve all nations for their Baptismal Creed. But the method of historical criticism barred this hypothesis. Besides, it is not pleasant for people to be made to feel as the swart Moor of Venice felt when he exclaimed,

Othello's occupation's gone.

For the one Symbol, therefore, which, as Cassian, the disciple and deacon of St. Chrysostom, puts it, "expresses the Faith of all the Churches,"[5] we shall seek one origin. The variations in its form are easily accounted for by the necessity that arose in particular Churches for a more explicit statement of the doctrines it contained. And by what way shall we proceed in our quest? Not by the way of historical criticism, for that way is blocked.

[4] Cf. *The Church Quarterly Review*, Oct., 1902, pp. 218–22.

[5] Migne, tom. 50, col. 145.

It leads those who follow it, as has been already pointed out, into a cul-de-sac. The historical critic searches for the Symbol, or traces of the Symbol, among the remains of early Christian literature, after much the same manner as the biologist seeks for a species, or traces of a species, among the fossil remains of early geological epochs.[6] This is all well enough. But in the eagerness of his search, he overlooks a point of capital importance. Between literary remains and the fossil remains of plant or animal there is a radical distinction. The latter are mute and voiceless; the former, being the product of the living mind, have a tongue and can deliver their message to those who find them. Now, here is where the method of historical criticism is at fault. It takes the Symbol, by dint of piecing together the scattered elements of it, from the writings of Cyril and Rufinus and Augustine, and pays not the slightest heed to the warning which these same writings deliver at the same time. The very same writers who are the first to describe and expound the Symbol, and in the very act of describing it, tell us, in the most distinct way, and with patient iteration, that they did not themselves get the Symbol from written records, but from the lips of the living Church. What sort of criticism is it that is willing to trust these writers when they tell us what the articles of the Symbol were in their day, and in what order they were arranged, but will not trust them when they tell us how the Symbol was transmitted to them by their forefathers in the faith? It is silly of the critic to fancy that he can run with the hare and hunt with the hounds after this fashion. "I will accept nothing," he declares, "but what I can find documentary evidence for." All very well. But let the whole evidence be taken. It will not do to take this because it fits in with a preconceived theory, and reject that because it doesn't. The method that picks and chooses in this way is neither critical nor historical. "The very confession of Faith in Father, Son, and Holy Ghost," says St. Basil, "from what written records have we it?" The critic may, if he likes, put this statement of St. Basil's to the test, and proceed to ransack written records for the Confession of Faith. He has a perfect right to do this. But he has no warrant, and no shadow of warrant, on

[6] *Dogma, Gierarchia e Culto*, p. 322.

failing to find it, as he was foredoomed to fail, to say that the Symbol did not then exist at all. This is an assumption so arbitrary that it is difficult to speak of it with composure. His assumed first principle will not let the critic see that he has been looking in the wrong place for the Symbol.

In our quest for the origin of the Creed, then, we shall set out, not with an assumed first principle, but with a fact proved by documentary evidence, and proved up to the hilt, namely, that the Creed was not transmitted in writing to the Christians of the fourth and fifth centuries, but handed down by word of mouth, and "graved on the fleshly tablets of the heart." The knowledge of this fact will be as a lamp unto our feet. In the light of it we shall not look for the Symbol itself in the writings of the earlier time, assured beforehand that it is not to be found there. We shall look only for traces of it, tokens of its existence in the minds and hearts of believers, in the mouths and on the lips of the neophyte and the martyr, and these we shall find in plenty.

Of course, no comprehensive or minute search into original sources can be made here, nor shall it be attempted, nor is it, indeed, needful. We shall pick up in passing one or two allusions to the Symbol from third century writings, and proceed straightway to the second century, which is to-day the battle-ground of the rival theories as to its origin.

Eutychianus, who became Pope in 275, A.D., says in the course of a pastoral charge to the Roman clergy: "See that you teach your flocks the Symbol and the Lord's Prayer."[7] In his letter to Magnus, written before the middle of the third century, St. Cyprian declares that, while those who are cut off from the communion of the Catholic Church "are baptized in the same Symbol as we are," yet they "have not the same law (interpretation) of the Symbol as we have, nor the same interrogatory."[8] In the time of St. Cyprian, therefore, the Baptismal Creed was known as the Symbol.[9] And the Saint draws a clear distinction between this Creed and the *trina interrogatio* or triple interroga-

[7] Migne, tom. 5, col. 166.

[8] Migne, tom. 3, col. 1143.

[9] Semeria says, in the work already cited: "S. Cypriano . . forse usa nello stesso nostro senso la voce simbolo." Tutt 'altro che "forse."

tory which is in use in the Church to this day. It is important to note this. The Symbol goes before the interrogatory in Cyprian, and this is the logical order. For the triple query of the minister of baptism supposes a knowledge of the Symbol in the candidate for baptism, else he could not make an intelligent reply. From this we may conclude that the Symbol is not derived from the interrogatory, but conversely, the interrogatory from the Symbol. Finally, there are distinct traces of the Symbol, nearly all the elements of it, indeed, to be found in a treatise on the Trinity written by Novatian, the schismatical anti-Pope and founder of the Novatian heresy, about 260, A.D. The opening words are: "The Rule of Truth requires that we should first of all believe in God the Father and Lord Almighty."[10]

Tertullian is a witness to the faith and traditions of the second century, his most notable works having been written in its closing years, or in the opening years of the century that follows. There are in his writings references almost without number to the Creed of the Church in his day. He does not call it by the name of Symbol, though he does use in describing it the word "tessera," which is also from the Greek and has the same meaning.[11] To Tertullian the Creed is "the doctrine," the "tradition," and more especially the "Law" or "Rule of Faith." In these several works[12] he gives us a more or less explicit statement of its articles, with a certain slight variation in each case. These are exhibited below in a tabular form for purposes of comparison with one another and with the Old Roman Creed.

Old Roman Creed.	De Praescript.	Adv. Prax.	De Virg. Vel.
(1) I believe in God the Father Almighty,	(1) I believe in one God, maker of the world,	(1) We believe one only God,	(1) Believing in one only God Almighty, maker of the world,
(2) and in Christ Jesus, His only Son, our Lord,	(2) the Word, called His Son, Jesus Christ,	(2) and the Son and Word of one only God, called Jesus Christ,	(2) and His Son, Jesus Christ,

[10] Migne, *ib.*, col. 885.

[11] I cite Father Semeria (*op. cit.*, p. 321) as authority here, not having been able to verify a statement for which he gives no reference.

[12] *De Praescript.*, *Contra Praxeam*, *De Virginibus Velandis*; Migne, tom. 2, cols. 26, 156, 889.

(3) Born of the Holy Ghost and the Virgin Mary,	(3) by the Spirit and power of God the Father made flesh in Mary's womb, and born of her,	(3) born Man and God of the Virgin,	(3) born of the Virgin Mary,
(4) Crucified under Pontius Pilate and buried,	(4) fastened to a cross,	(4) Him suffered, dead, and buried.	(4) crucified under Pontius Pilate,
(5) Rose again the third day from the dead.	(5) He rose the third day;	(5) brought back to life by the Father,	(5) on the third day brought to life from the dead,
(6) Ascended into heaven,	(6) was caught up into heaven,	(6) taken again into heaven,	(6) received in heaven,
(7) Sitteth at the right hand of the Father,	(7) sat at the right hand of the Father,	(7) sits at right hand of the Father,	(7) sits now at right hand of Father,
(8) whence He shall come to judge quick and dead.	(8) will come with glory to take the good into life eternal, and condemn the wicked to perpetual fire,	(8) will come to judge living and dead,	(8) will come to judge living and dead.
(9) And in the Holy Ghost,	(9) Sent the vicarious power of His Holy Spirit,	(9) From the Father the Holy Ghost Paraclete,	
(10) the holy Church,	(10) to govern believers,		
(11) remission of sins,			
(12) resurrection of the flesh.	(12) restoration of the flesh.		(12) through resurrection of the flesh.

We have here, in the writings of Tertullian, all the articles of the Old Roman Creed except the tenth (which is implied in one instance) and the eleventh. Are we to infer, because these two articles are wanting, that they were not to be found in the Creed that was in use in his day? By no means. Tertullian does not pretend to cite that formulary word for word. The words given above in parallel columns are picked from their context, where they are found, in some instances, mingled with

extraneous matter. Besides, the phrases in the several columns do not tally exactly with one another, nor with the words of the Old Roman Creed. Nor is the same number of articles given in each case, nor are the same ones. Thus, the twelfth article is wanting in *Adversus Praxeam*, and the ninth in *De Virginibus Velandis*, wherein the form approaches most closely to that of the Old Roman Creed. But who can doubt that the Rule of Faith which Tertullian so often refers to, and which he declares to be "absolutely one, alone unchangeable, and irreformable,"[13] had its setting of words fixed uniform, the same for all?

We may surmise that Tertullian's object in varying, as he does, the words in which he conveys the doctrines of the Creed was to veil from the uninitiated the sacred Symbol of the Faith, in accordance with the prevailing discipline of the secret. The economy of his language recalls that passage in the *Stromata* of St. Clement of Alexandria where he says that there are some things which his writing "will only name, and will attempt, while concealing yet to declare, and though hiding to manifest, and though silent to point out." One is at a loss otherwise to account for the curious circumstance that, in the three several places where Tertullian professes to be setting forth the content of the Rule of Faith, once and once only does he use exactly the same form of words, as a glance at the table given above will show.

But be this as it may, certain it is that we cannot rightly infer a given article to have been wanting in the Creed of Tertullian from the mere circumstance of his not making explicit mention of it. In the very passage in which he professes to be giving the "one, unchangeable, irreformable" Rule of Faith, he omits the ninth article, which he nevertheless gives in the other two places. What is more, we gather from a passage in his *Liber de Baptismo* that the tenth article, embodying belief in "the holy Church," was part of the Creed in his day. "Since, however," he there says, "the profession of faith is made and the pledge of salvation given under three (names), mention of the Church is necessarily added. For where the three are, that is, the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, there is the Church, which is their body."[14] The

[13] *De Virg. Vel.*, loc. cit.

[14] Migne, tom. 1, col. 1206.

Baptismal Creed, therefore, included the tenth article in Tertullian's time. And if one were to infer from his not mentioning it in any of the three passages referred to above, that it was not included, the inference would be false and contrary to fact. Is there not the very strongest kind of presumption that a similar inference drawn from the same premises with regard to the eleventh article would similarly be unwarranted? Besides, the doctrine of the remission of sins is expressly affirmed in the treatise on Baptism (chaps. 6 and 10).

Irenæus, the disciple of that Polycarp "who had not only been trained by the Apostles, and had conversed with many of those who had seen Christ, but also had been constituted by the Apostles Bishop over Asia, in the Church of Smyrna,[15] is our greatest and most authoritative witness to the existence from the beginning and the Apostolic authorship of the Creed. He speaks of it in one place as "this outline"[16] (in the Greek, χαρακτῆρα) which corresponds to "symbol," the "tessera" of Tertullian, and the Latin "indicium" of Rufinus), but usually as the Tradition, and specifically as the Rule of Truth. With him, too, as with Tertullian, this "Rule of the Truth which he received by (in) his Baptism,"[17] is one and the same in all the world. After setting forth the principal articles of it, as exhibited in the first column of the syllabus given below, he goes on to say:

This preaching and this faith, the Church, as we said before, dispersed as she is in the whole world, keeps diligently, as though she dwelt but in one house; and her belief herein is just as if she had only one soul, and the same heart, and she proclaims and teaches and delivers these things harmoniously, as possessing one mouth. Thus while the languages of the world differ, the tenor of the tradition is one and the same. And neither have the Churches situated in the regions of Germany believed otherwise, nor do they hold any other tradition, neither in the parts of Spain, nor among the Celts, nor in the East, nor in Egypt, nor in Libya, nor those which are situate in the middle parts of the world. . . . Nor will he who is weak in discourse abate aught of the Tradition. Yea, the Faith being one

[15] Adv. Haer., 1, 3, c. 3, 4. Not having this work in the original, I shall cite the English translation by Keble.

[16] Book 2, chap. 28, i.

[17] Bk. 1, c. 9, 4.

and the same, neither he that is able to speak much of it hath anything over, nor hath he that speaks but little any lack.[18]

As in Tertullian, so in Irenæus, we find three different forms of the Creed. They are arranged, article by article, in the following syllabus:

SYLLABUS OF CREED FORMS FOUND IN IRENAEUS.

Book First, c. 10, 1.	Book Third, c. 4, 2.	Book Fourth, c. 33, 7.
(1) Faith in one God the Father Almighty;	(1) Who believe in one God the Framer of Heaven and Earth,	(1) His faith is entire in one God Almighty, of whom are all things;
(2) and in one Christ Jesus, the Son of God	(2) by Christ Jesus, the Son of God	(2) and in the Son of God, Jesus Christ.
(3) made flesh for our salvation, of a Virgin,	(3) who submitted to the birth which was to be of the Virgin;	(3) the Son of God become man
(4) and the Passion,	(4) who suffered also under Pontius Pilate,	(4)
(5) and the Rising from the dead	(5) and risen again,	(5)
(6) and the bodily Ascension into Heaven,	(6) and being received in brightness	(6)
(7)	(7)	(7)
(8) and His Coming from the Heavens in the glory of the Father . . . that He may administer just judgment to them all,	(8) will come in glory as the Judge of them that are judged	(8)
(9) and in the Holy Ghost,	(9)	(9) and in the Spirit of God
(10) who declared the Œconomies,	(10)	(10) the original system of the Church in the whole world[19]
(11) such as . . . persevered in His love, whether from the first or after penitency,	(11)	(11)
(12) and to raise up all flesh of all human nature.	(12)	(12)

[18] *Ib.*, c. 10, 2.

[19] To Irenæus the Church is not so much an article of the faith as its teacher and guardian.

From all of these forms the seventh article is wanting and the eleventh, which latter, however, is very clearly implied in the words cited above in the first column. We note the same peculiarity in these as in the forms found in Tertullian—a marked difference in the wording of the several articles, which is hard to believe to have been accidental. One thing is plain: neither Tertullian nor Irenæus gives us the very words, the *ipsissima verba*, of their Rule of Faith. Those words were written in their memories from the day of their baptism, but as if to baffle the curiosity of the curious, they do not choose to write them out. To try, therefore, to piece together from their writings the fabric of the Creed just as it stood in their day, were as futile as the act of one who should essay to build upon the shifting sands. But knowing what to do and what they tell us of the veneration in which this Rule of Truth was held, the jealous care with which it was guarded, the pains that were taken to grave it "on the fleshly tablets of the heart" of lettered and unlettered alike, the absolute oneness of the Faith of which it was the authorized Formula, the quality of unchangeableness that belonged and still belongs to it, we seem certainly not to lack warrant for affirming that the Creed learned by Irenæus from Polycarp was, article for article, if not word for word, the same as that which was recited two centuries after in the Church of Smyrna; and that the Creed in which the catechumen Tertullian professed his faith on the day of his baptism, was, in like manner, the same as that which St. Augustine expounds in his homilies.

This Rule of Truth, Irenæus assures us in the passage cited above, was the same in the East as in the West. And it was, he further assures us, transmitted by word of mouth. "To this Rule," he says, "consent many nations of the barbarians, those I mean who believe in Christ, having salvation written by the Spirit in their hearts, without paper and ink, and diligently keeping the old Tradition, who believe in One God the Framer of Heaven and Earth and of all things that are in them, by Christ Jesus the Son of God." After which he goes on to give the other articles that are to be found in the second column of the syllabus.

Let us now pause to consider how untenable is the position of the votaries of historical criticism. Relying mainly, if not wholly,

on the testimony of Tertullian and Irenæus, they affirm that the Symbol existed in the latter half of the second century. But it did not exist in the earlier half of the same century, say the critics, because it is not to be found in any writings. Consequently, it must have been composed about the middle of that century. By whom, and where? Probably at Rome, by some one or other whose name has been withheld.[20] We are asked to believe that the Creed of the Christian Church, the Creed which we know on the testimony of witnesses who lived at the time, to have been, already in the second half of the century, the unvarying Standard of the Christian Faith in all the Churches from the West even to the farthest East, was composed about the middle of that same century by an anonymous somebody. This Creed, which all the Bishops assembled at Nice could scarce venture to change by the addition of words that did but more explicitly declare the meaning of one or two of its articles, is assumed to have been framed and imposed upon the Christian world less than two centuries before by somebody or other whose very name is buried in oblivion. *Credat Judaeus!*

But this is not all. The very men, on whose testimony the existence of the Creed in the latter half of the second century is known to the critics,[21] declare repeatedly, in the most explicit and emphatic way, that it came down from the Apostles. This, however, as well as some other points, must be dealt with at another time.

ALEX. MACDONALD, D.D.

St. Francis Xavier's College, Antigonish, Nova Scotia.

[20] *Dogma, Gerarchio e Culto*, p. 324.

[21] Harnack's theory that the "Rule of Truth" given by Iranæus is not the same as Tertullian's "Rule of Faith," which he admits to be identical with the Old Roman Creed, and that it was not at all a Baptismal Creed, will be discussed in the next article.

Analecta.

E. SECRETARIA BREVIUM.

I.

CIRCA FACULTATEM BENEDICENDI GEMINAM SPECIEM NUMISMATUM S. BENEDICTI.

LEO PP. XIII.

Ad perpetuam rei memoriam.

Dilecti filii Hildebrandus de Hemptinne, Ordinis S. Benedicti, et Bonifacius Krug Abbas Ordinarius Montis Cassini curavere exponendum Nobis ex benignitate Romanorum Pontificum Decessorum Nostrorum cruces sive numismata a S. Benedicto nuncupata amplissimis indulgentiis fuisse aucta ac ditata. Horum geminas extare species, alteram communem et alteram a centenario anno MDCCCLXXX in vulgus diffundi coeptam. Verum cum nonnullae modo ortae sint dubitationes de usu facultatum benedicendi ipsa numismata eamque aliis veniam delegandi, ut omnis prorsus ambigendi causa tollatur, enixas Nobis iidem dilecti filii preces humiliter adhibuere ut interposita Apostolica Nostra auctoritate decernere idcirco velimus. Nos autem piis hisce votis libenti quidem animo annuentes ut et Nosmet Ipsi Benedicti

Patris Ordinem tot tantisque nominibus optime de Ecclesia Dei deque humana societate meritum peculiari amoris charitatisque studio complectamur, de omnipotentis Dei misericordia ac BB. Petri et Pauli Apostolorum eius auctoritate confisi per praesentes perpetuum in modum concedimus ut omnes sacerdotes Ordinis S. Benedicti nunc et in posterum simpliciter sive solemniter professi privilegio huiusmodi benedicendi utriusque generis numismata, servatis servandis, utantur: ut Abbates qui praesunt Congregationibus gaudeant praeterea facultate delegandi sacerdotes saeculares ac regulares ad utriusque numismatum generis benedictionem: ut Abbati Primati atque Abbati Ordinario Montis Cassini praeter iura praecedentibus concessa ius insuper competat tribuendi facultatem quibusdam sacerdotibus ut et ipsi licentiam benedicendi praefatas cruces, seu numismata communia aliis quoque concedere possint. Quam quidem subdelegandi licentiam si agatur de numismatibus a centenario dictis ad originem eorundem numismatum efficacius recolendam penes solum Abbatem Ordinarium Archicoenobii Cassinensis esse volumus et mandamus. Contrariis non obstantibus quibuscumque. Praesentibus perpetuo valituris. Volumus autem ut praesentium litterarum transumptis seu exemplis etiam impressis manu alicuius notarii publici subscriptis et sigillo personae in ecclesiastica dignitate constitutae munitis eadem prorsus adhibeatur fides quae adhiberetur ipsis praesentibus si forent exhibitae vel ostensae.

Datum Romae apud S. Petrum sub annulo Piscatoris die XII Aprilis MCMII, Pont. Nostri Anno XXV.

PRO DOM. *Card.* MACCHI,
N. MARINI, *Substitutus.*

II.

LEO XIII LAETITIAM CUM ARCHIEPISCOPO SANCTI PAULI DE MINNESOTA PARTICIPAT, QUOAD CELEBRATIONEM QUINQUAGESIMI ANNI EX QUO SEDES CATHEDRALIS ERECTA EST.

LEO PP. XIII.

Venerabilis frater, salutem et apostolicam benedictionem.

Quinquaginta annorum spatio feliciter emenso, ex quo Paulopolitanae civitati honor episcopalis Cathedrae delatus fuit, iure

catholicorum istorum animi laetitia gestiunt, parantque gratias Deo agere celebritate maxima. Praeteriti enim temporis memoriam repentibus obversantur nascentis istius eeclesiae primordia, exigua illa quidem atque humilia; fideles namque ad centena aliquot numerabantur nec nisi terni erant sacerdotes, qui sacra administrarent. At modo, Paulopolitana Sedes ad archiepiscopalem evecta, senas dioeceses obnoxias habet; omnesque non modo cleri ac fidelium frequentia, verum etiam pietate et catholicis institutis in exemplum florent. Libenter igitur, Venerabilis Frater, laetitiam vestram vobiscum communicamus; quasque vos Deo Optimo Maximo gratias acturi estis, easdem et Nos agemus, enixe implorantes ut qui vobis exordia uberrime fortunavit, laetioribus in dies incrementis augeat. Quia vero non ignoramus hanc rerum conditionem solatii plenam, maximam partem, deberi tibi, qui Paulopolitanae ecclesiae iam triginta et sex annis impendis operam; gratulamur navitati tuae, eaque quae sit etiam in posterum strenue factura iucunde ex hactenus actis praecipimus. Interea, testem caritatis Nostrae ac munerum divinorum auspicem tibi, Episcopis, clero ac fidelibus Paulopolitanae provinciae Apostolicam benedictionem amantissime impertimus.

Datum Romae apud S. Petrum die XVIII Iunii MDCCCCI, Pontificatus Nostri anno vicesimo quarto.

III.

Litterae Quibus.

LEO XIII.

Gratulatur Rev. Dom. H. T. Henry, Lit. Doct., ob Versionem Carminum Summi Pontificis Anglice redditam.

Illme Domine,

Volumen carminum, quae a Pontifice Maximo exarata tu anglice diuturnis curis reddidisti, non uno nomine eidem Pontifici pergratum accidit. Fecit namque pietas ut hunc Beatissimo Patri honorem haberes. Peritiae vero, qua praestas, tum latini tum patrii sermonis tribuendum quod susceptum opus cum laude perfeceris. Habeto igitur a Summo Pontifice gratias pro merito. Quas Ipse ut non agat modo sed etiam referat, apostolicam

benedictionem, suae pignus benevolentiae, tibi peculiari affectu impertitur.

Quod mihi exemplar laudati voluminis destinasti libenter habui. Tibique gratum animum testatus, peculiari existimatione me tibi profiteor

Addictissimum

MAR. *Card.* RAMPOLLA.

Romae, die 13 Decembris 1902.

E SACRA CONGREGATIONE RITUUM.

DIVIDANTUR VESPERAE, QUANDO FESTUM S. FAMILIAE CONCURRIT CUM FESTO SS. CORONAE SPINEAE.

Rmus Dnus Onesimus Machez, canonicus ecclesiae Cathedralis Atrebaten. et extensor Kalendarii dioecesani, de licentia R.mi sui Ordinarii a Sacrorum Rituum Congregatione sequentis dubii humillime resolutionem expostulavit, nimirum: Quomodo anno proximo 1902 ordinandae sint Vesperae festi Sanctae Familiae Nazarenae quod, ex Apostolica concessione, transfertur ad feriam V post Cineres, et ita concurrit cum primis Vesperis SSmae Coronae Spineae cujus officium apponitur insequenti die?

Et Sacra eadem Congregatio, referente subscripto Secretario, exquisito voto Commissionis Liturgicae, omnibusque rite perpensis, rescribendum censuit: *Dividantur Vesperae juxta Rubricas.*

Atque ita rescripsit. Die 4 Martii 1901.

D. *Card.* FERRATA, *Praef.*

D. PANICI, *Archiep. Laodicen., Secret.*

Conferences.

THE ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW proposes to answer in this department questions of general (not merely local or personal) interest to the Clergy. Questions suitable for publication, when addressed to the editor, receive attention in due turn, but in no case do we pledge ourselves to reply to all queries, either in print or by letter.

OUR ANALECTA.

The Roman documents for the month are:

I.—An APOSTOLIC LETTER by which the faculty of blessing the medals and crosses of St. Benedict is indiscriminately granted to all priests of the Benedictine Order who have made either their simple or solemn profession. This includes the privilege of blessing the centenary medals (1880) of the same Order.

The abbots of the Order have moreover the power of delegating the same faculty to priests of any other Order and to seculars. To the abbots (primatial and ordinary) of Monte Cassino is reserved the right of sub-delegating the above-mentioned faculties.

II.—The S. CONGREGATION OF BRIEFS publishes the text of the congratulatory Letter sent by the Holy Father to His Grace the Archbishop of St. Paul, Minn., on occasion of the fiftieth anniversary of the erection of that see.

III.—His Eminence CARDINAL RAMPOLLA addresses a congratulatory Letter from the Holy Father to the Rev. Dr. Hugh T. Henry, of Overbrook Seminary, in recognition of the translation of the *Poems, Charades and Inscriptions*, of which a copy had been presented to the august Pontiff.

IV.—The S. CONGREGATION OF RITES decides that when the feast *Spineae Coronae* follows immediately upon the feast *Sacrae Familiae* transferred to the first Thursday in Lent, the vespers in the Canonical Office are *a cap. de sequente*.

"THE MESSENGER."

The Messenger—we mean that dear old "*Messenger of the Sacred Heart*" as it used to be in the days of its devout adolescence—sends us a marked copy of its January number containing an editorial in which somebody reads us a wholesome lesson on the error of our ways.

We had said in the December number of THE ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW: "A good, large, carefully written encyclopædia published under Catholic auspices and censorship would do all the work which half a dozen wide-awake Truth Societies can accomplish in the same direction. The expense would be less, the effect greater, more permanent, penetrating, and conclusive. If a newspaper were to talk us down by misrepresenting Catholic doctrine, Catholic morals and aims, we should at once be able to cite facts, with chapter and verse, and bigotry itself would not be able to hide itself under false pretences of quoting authentic sources, when it goes to the *Britannica* or any other other 'poisoned well' for its definitions and statistics about Catholic matters."

Now some wicked person has persuaded *The Messenger*, or whoever writes the indignant apostrophe in its editorial columns, that we are "impatient with the well directed efforts of our Catholic Truth Societies," and that our suggestion implies "a reflection on the excellent work of our Catholic Truth Societies." We protest—no; we had no such intention. The editor of THE ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW greatly values coöperation in the cause of truth, and would sacrifice all his little energy and possessions to further it. In fact he belongs to several Truth Societies, pays his dues pretty regularly, and does some other things to make truth popular. Of course, if a "Truth Society" were to play merely the part of supplying zealous stage-actors with means of advertising their personal merits, or if its managers gave occasional object-lessons in what literary men call "pirating," of goods made across the sea, we should call these efforts at disseminating truth, by sundry disguised violations of the divine commands, anything but "well directed." But it did not occur to us to criticise this sort of thing, because there are others who have a better right than we to exercise censorship in such

matters. What we did wish to urge by our otherwise harmless remarks was—a little more systematic and combined literary activity so as to create certain respectable and reliable Catholic repertories of information. One such, and a most needed and effective one, would be an exhaustive and representative Catholic encyclopædia, like Herder's *Konversations Lexicon*, or Wetzer and Welte's *Kirchenlexion*, published by the same firm. That class of works produced by the combined and systematized activity of English-speaking Catholic scholars would enable every reading Catholic to answer promptly all the difficulties urged in matters of our holy religion; it would enable non-Catholic inquirers after truth to inform themselves at first-hand regarding questions of Catholic history and doctrine which are vulgarly misrepresented; it would leave no excuse open to the evil-minded journalist or the prejudiced encyclopædist or the bigoted teacher who cites statistics against the Catholic Church from popular non-Catholic works, knowing that the average reader has no means of verifying them, and that Catholics themselves could not refer the truth-loving inquirer to any standard work in our language which would give satisfactory information to a cultured man or woman. If we expressed the belief that such a work is quite as important a factor in creating and fostering right appreciation of the Catholic religion in America, and that it would effect more real good than a number of separate Truth Societies, we simply harbored a hope that must commend itself to every sensible and well-meaning Catholic.

And it is a hope that is not at all chimerical. It could easily find its accomplishment, if we united our scattered forces instead of localizing the interest around some individual energy which, however good in its place, might be diverted into a more powerful current, if it could be induced to merge its individuality in the larger channel for the general good. The English Catholic Truth Society is an example in point. It is a magnificent force doing untold good by printing and distributing an enormous amount of really first-class literature. It is a society unified, recognized by every parish in the United Kingdom and the Colonies; even the few local Truth Societies in Ireland and other parts, created for secondary purposes, coöperate with the main body, which has its

centre and directing boards in London. If the literary activity of English and Irish Catholics at home has not as yet produced a work such as has been suggested, and for which a need was felt long ago, it is due, we venture to say, to the fact that besides a literary contributing force there is needed a large financial force. There must be a sufficiently large reading public to encourage a publisher to undertake the task of furnishing the first outlay. Such a public might be found in America. In numbers we are not deficient, nor in the habit of reading, nor in that general intelligence which is capable of appreciating the value of correct information on historic and moral topics.

True, the capacity of appreciating such works is not yet an appreciation of actual value to a publisher. But we Truth Society leaders and editors and writers might utilize this capacity to educate our intelligent reading public to the practical appreciation of something more solid than stories and glorifications of our little mutual benevolent schemes. It was with this object that we began publishing THE DOLPHIN, and Pope Leo's classical verses in classical translation. THE DOLPHIN was labeled for "educated Catholics." The critics, even the best-intentioned and those engaged in raising the tone of Catholic reading matter at their own personal sacrifice, met us half-way by saying—very loud—"My dear DOLPHIN, you are trying to swim up in the air. We have no *educated Catholics* in this country. The rich have made their money and their comforts by a jump at fortune; they have no taste for solid reading, if they know how to read at all. As for the few respectable and really educated people amongst us, they having failed to give their attention to money-making, are too poor to buy your high-toned literature. We tell you, you will die!"

But we did not die; and we found a daily increasing number of serious, educated Catholics all over the land; first the religious, and then others. And now our Protestant universities, and the public libraries have found out that Catholic literature is not so meagre, that Catholics have something serious to say all the time in behalf of their position; and so THE DOLPHIN is in demand on the reading-table and on the public news-stands. Even if we had not found a welcome from a sufficiently large number of

high-minded readers, we should still have kept on with THE DOLPHIN, for its purpose was to create a taste, as far as possible, which might not very largely exist, but which was very desirable, and would materially aid the work of propagating Catholic truth. And with this in view we not only made a free offer to some of our Catholic societies that they might utilize matter which appeared in the REVIEW or in THE DOLPHIN and which was otherwise copyrighted, whenever it seemed desirable; but we also reprinted for others, who asked us for such service, at our expense, thousands of tracts and pamphlets to be distributed by them at their own discretion, or which they might sell to the profit of their cause at a nominal cost.

But we have said enough to explain our attitude toward Catholic Truth Societies that are really such. One word more, about what seems to us an unreasonable sensitiveness to criticism which is directed, not for the purpose of wounding or depreciating any individual or any class of active workers in the Church, but with the single view of dissipating mists which hinder us from getting a proper estimate of our position toward those whom we must either convince or repel. Such criticism, even if it humbles us, is a gain if it makes us aware of our weakness before an enemy makes us aware of it by inflicting a wound upon the delicate spot. Active literary life and priestly activity should mean very little for good, if we were to confine ourselves to attacking open enemies of the faith whilst catering to the conceits of those who look to us for leadership in battle. Surely a general gains nothing by abusing his soldiers, but he gains much by keeping them alive to the danger that comes from disorder in the ranks. The generation with which we have to deal knows its virtues only too well, and somehow not only claims all the virtues of its ancestors but talks forever of the glorious future of this hopeful Republic as if it were all done in advance by ourselves. It is very true that none of us has a right to set himself up as a corrector of his brethren, although the priestly commission limits or rather directs that principle of charity in certain cases; but we take the criticism of an editor when he recognizes a defect which hinders the straight movement in his own ranks, and speaks of it to his brethren, to be without sinister purpose and applicable to

himself as to them. Religion in its general as well as in its restricted sense is a school of correction; and to be wincing at every intimation that we should clean our guns and practice uniformity instead of perpetually denouncing the poor heretics, who sin often in ignorance, is unworthy of our name.

We do not want to quarrel, or even seem to do so, with any one who wears the glorious badge of the Society of Jesus. To us the splendid traditions of the Sons of St. Ignatius are forever an unsuspected pattern upon which we should, as defenders of our holy religion, wish to regulate our conduct in public and in private. If at times we fail to recognize that noble inheritance in a token which claims the signature of the Society, the fault is not perhaps wholly ours. "The Messenger of the Sacred Heart" has been an organ of which every Catholic might justly be proud. Like *The Ave Maria*, it made its peerless aim of a distinct devotion the guiding star of its policy. But of late it has, unlike *The Ave Maria*, entered upon a new path, a certain aggrestive method which, if it begets success, robs it of that grand prerogative of true progress which is the distinguishing characteristic of the Society of Jesus. May the editor of *The Messenger*, who has inaugurated this new movement, pardon us if we say that the indications of sensational effort in his recent methods have made us conscious of the fact that since we miss the device "of the Sacred Heart" from the title of the *Messenger*, we miss also that gentle force of wisdom which is *pudica, pacifica*. To be a successful defender of Catholic truth it is not necessary to engage in attacks supported by exaggerated statements or demands. The solid and consistent activity of the *Civiltà*, *The Month*, the *Stimmen aus Maria Laach*, or the *Messager du Sacré Cœur* inspires respect by their dignified conservative methods, and *The Messenger* might easily do the same by a judicious but well determined policy. As it is, there is an evident lack of that strong reliance upon the force of truth which needs no exaggeration to produce effects for good. Clamor may frighten people, but it does not convert them. In the "Friars" and the "Appleton" controversy, as in that of the Klauder Catechism, the editor of *The Messenger* was undoubtedly on the right side; but in none of these cases did he, as chief defender of an excellent cause, show any remarkable sagacity, or

that deliberate appreciation of power which does justice to an opponent and seeks to convince those who are not also convinced by mere noisy appeal. This we say with conscious deliberation, and in view of all the utterances that lie before us of *The Messenger*, but also with a sincere and deep respect for the devotion and the honesty of purpose as well as the many excellent personal qualities of the editor, who has made himself responsible for the expressed attitude of *The Messenger* in these controversies. Happily our laity, those especially who read *The Messenger*, will not cavil at the utterances, even if they should discern the inconsistency of its methods. Nor should they; the magazine is in every other respect such a help for good, such a blessing to our people, that we would wish to see it in every home of the land. And if we have said aught to lessen the appreciation of its present conduct, it is rather in self-defence, and in the hope that *The Messenger* and THE ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW or THE DOLPHIN will have no antagonism, even if they should happen to differ on certain open questions.

HOLY COMMUNION IMMEDIATELY AFTER MIDNIGHT.

Qu. I have been asked to bring Holy Communion at 12 o'clock or at midnight to a person who is ill and has been so for several months. She cannot fast until morning. Before she came to this place the priest where she resided gave her Holy Communion after 12 o'clock at midnight. Can I do it? It used to be that this could not be done. Is there any recent change in the matter?

Resp. There is no prohibition against giving Holy Communion under the above mentioned circumstances. The contrary view seems to arise out of a misinterpretation of the rubrics of the Ritual. These state (Tit. iv., cap, 4 and 10, De Communione Infirm.) on the one hand that the sick who receive Holy Communion from motives of devotion, and not as an immediate preparation for death (Viaticum), must observe the fast enjoined upon all persons communicating through devotion. On the other hand the rubrics, prescribing the manner in which the Blessed

Eucharist is to be carried to the sick, forbid that it be carried about at night, except in cases of necessity (*l. c.*, n. 10).

This latter injunction is plainly intended to safeguard the custom observed in Catholic countries of carrying the Blessed Sacrament with a due show of outward respect in which the faithful of the neighborhood are expected to take public part. The Ritual speaks (n. 9) of a procession attended by the people (members of the Eucharistic Confraternity or others who are prepared to accompany the Corpus Christi borne along by the priest vested in surplice, stole and cope, with acolytes and clerics reciting aloud the processional psalms). This is the ordinary manner in which the Blessed Sacrament is carried from the church, whither the sound of the bell calls those who are free to go to the house of the sick. Others join on the way, and all by whom the Eucharistic King passes on His merciful errand, genuflect and salute by the way. At the house of the sick, some friend or neighbor, or a member of the Eucharistic Confraternity has prepared the linen, the lights, the crucifix; the little domestic shrine in the sick chamber is decorated, flowers are strewn along the way to the room, the sodalists chant the hymn of the Blessed Sacrament, and altogether the visit of the Real Presence is a solemn event for the people of the parish who assist.

Now because this befitting demonstration of reverence and devotion cannot ordinarily be made without disturbance and confusion, or only imperfectly during the hours of night, therefore the Ritual prohibits the public carrying of the Blessed Eucharist to the sick, unless they be in danger of death, that is to say, in cases of necessity, when the ceremonial which otherwise is a duty has to be dispensed with owing to the urgent need of the sick person. This is what the Ritual prescribes as fitting, and it is assuredly what we should expect,—a practice which should be maintained wherever it is possible.

But in non-Catholic or missionary countries the Church dispenses generally from this outward ceremonial, which is the custom in Italy or France or Spain, where open reverence is paid to the Real Presence; and her motive is again the maintenance of reverence, but in this case from a different point of view. The procession accompanying the Blessed Sacrament when carried as

Viaticum or for devotional reception to the sick, would elicit disturbance or at least a danger of irreverence from those who do not understand our service and faith. And the old "discipline of the secret" (arcanum), which was observed in the early Church to guard the honor of religion against Pagan ignorance and bigotry, has been introduced among us, and dispenses us from this particular obligation imposed by the Ritual. We therefore carry the Blessed Sacrament to the sick very quietly, that is, without open show of any ceremonial which is likely to attract attention.

Now, since the Church dispenses us from the observance of the public and solemn ceremonial with which the Blessed Sacrament is to be carried to the sick in Catholic lands, she also removes the ground on which the prohibition to carry it by night mainly rested. We are, so to speak, obliged always to carry it at night, that is, in a concealed way which avoids the public attention. So far as public ceremonial is concerned there is no difference with us between the hour after midnight and the hour of noon.

There may, it is true, be other causes which make it prudent to observe a certain measure of the traditional Catholic legislation, even where new circumstances warrant their being set aside; and hence it would not be advisable to regard a new practice as a new rule. But it is only reasonable to keep the principle in the foreground, and to remember that the Blessed Sacrament which might be given to a patient through devotion with the dispensation of the Sovereign Pontiff without fasting, should be given to one who desires to receive it fasting if the priest can bring it to him at a suitable hour. The hour may be *unsuitable for a procession*, but it is always *suitable for one in need or ardently desirous of the Master Comforter's Real Presence.*

And this is what nearly all our prominent theologians seem to admit when they allow that Holy Communion may be brought during the night at Easter time to those who cannot sustain a long fast—this even in countries where the public carrying of the Blessed Sacrament is customary and ordinarily obligatory. It may be objected that this is a case of the Paschal precept, which cannot be urged in regard to Communions of mere

devotion. Very true; but the precept of Paschal Communion binds only those who can fulfil it so as not to conflict with some other positive law. If, therefore, the prohibition to carry the Holy Eucharist at night bind a priest, except in case of necessity (Viaticum), then the patient is not responsible if it be not given to him at other times; he would have no more right or duty to ask for Holy Communion at Easter than if the priest were sick or absent. We believe, therefore, that, apart from prudential reasons in which discretion may dictate a special diocesan law, there is no objection on the part of the Church to our carrying the Blessed Sacrament at midnight to the sick who cannot fast, so long as the discipline of private administration of the Holy Eucharist for the sick in general has the sanction of the Holy See. (Cf. *Lehmkuhl*, Vol. II, n. 161; 2. *Ballerini-Palmieri*, Op. Moral., Vol. IV, Tract. X, Sect. IV, n. 174 and 175, edit. 1891.)

DOES A LEGACY LIQUIDATE A DEBT?

Qu. Joe Winsom, building contractor, who had borrowed several sums of money from Jerry, a distant relative, in order to carry on his speculations, dies unexpectedly. In his will, made two years ago, he leaves a sum equivalent to about half of the contracted debt to Jerry. The remainder of his estate, including a life insurance, is bequeathed to a sister and in part to charities. The will, which contains the usual formula: "after paying all my lawful debts," appoints as executors the resident parish priest and Jerry.

The question I wish to ask is this: Does the sum bequeathed to Jerry by the term of the will liquidate part of the debt contracted by the testator; or is Jerry entitled to the bequest over and above the sum which he loaned to his departed relative? Jerry, himself, says that Winsom, the contractor, had shown him the will as a guarantee that, in the event of his death, Jerry would be secured against the loss of his money. But at the time this happened, the debt amounted to less than one-third of the nominal bequest; besides this it was secured by a mortgage of somewhat uncertain value. Afterwards Winsom borrowed more, and Jerry lent it to him without specific security, except a promissory note and the prospective success of the pending contracts. Winsom's sister and Jerry are not very friendly,

and there is a disposition to contest the relative claims. Both parties are, however, disposed to be advised by me. I should like to know what the law is likely to say, in case of litigation, but am more anxious about the moral view of the obligation devolving on me as executor on the one hand and spiritual adviser on the other.

Resp. "In equity, if a legacy equal or exceed the debt, it is presumed to have been intended to go in satisfaction; but if the legacy be less than the debt, it is deemed satisfaction for that amount." It is, however, an established fact that, as the Hon. Hugh Spalding sets forth in his formularies: "Courts allow very slight circumstances to rebut this presumption of payment: as where the debt was not contracted until after the making of the will; where the debt is unliquidated and the amount due not known; where the debt was due upon a bill or note negotiable; where the legacy is made payable after the debt falls due; where the legacy appears from the will to have been given with a different intention;" and in general, where the terms of the will express the intention of the testator that all debts and legacies be paid before or in addition to certain other provisions mentioned.

Now, since it is plain from the date of the will that the bequest was made before a debt to the same amount had been contracted, the court would in all probability interpret the intention of the testator to have been a purely benevolent one; that is to say, the legacy was intended to be a gift, partly in recognition of the kindly services of Jerry, partly in acknowledgment of kinship and friendly relations. For the fact that the bequest was made at a time when the debt (which might be supposed to balance it in part) was not only much less than the amount of the legacy, but was separately provided for by a mortgage, indicates that it was not intended as a collateral pure and simple against the debt.

Furthermore, the will states the intention of the deceased to bequeath the sums alloted to the various legatees "after paying all lawful debts," thus distinguishing between Jerry as a creditor and Jerry as an heir.

Such would be most likely the trend of a decision in an American court of equity, apart from certain State legal pro-

visions, as, for instance, where a legatee or heir is disqualified if named executor or witness, when a will is thereby rendered illegal, that is, void.

In conscience the executor may avail himself of the favorable provisions of the law. If, however, the known intention of the testator is frustrated by any accidental lack of legal formalities, the priest would still be not only justified, but even bound to use his legitimate and recognized influence with the contending parties to carry out that intention, yet so as not to effect any contempt for the legal formalities which the external order of things may require for the common good.

THE CARDINAL NEWMAN MEMORIAL.

It is with entire gratification that we act upon the suggestion of His Eminence Cardinal Gibbons, expressed in his subjoined letter to us, by opening in the pages of THE ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW and THE DOLPHIN a subscription toward the Fund for the erection of a new church at the Oratory, Birmingham, the home of Cardinal Newman. In urging this noble project His Eminence Cardinal Gibbons writes to us:

BALTIMORE, January 2, 1903.

MY DEAR FATHER HEUSER,—

You are no doubt aware that Father Robert Eaton has received a mission from his superior, the Very Rev. Fr. Ryder, of the Birmingham Oratory, to solicit aid in the United States for the erection of a Memorial Church to Cardinal Newman. Perhaps there is no English-speaking prelate in the world whose name is held in higher veneration than that of the illustrious Oratorian. The number of those is legion who have entered the pale of the Church through the influence of his writings and charming personality.

I hope you will do all you can to make known and encourage Father Eaton's mission in the pages of the REVIEW and of THE DOLPHIN.

Faithfully yours in Christ,

J. CARD. GIBBONS.

No project could have been conceived to honor more effectually and nobly the memory of one whose name is a synonym for everything that appeals to the heart and intelligence of an educated Catholic speaking the English tongue. The proposal is not to erect a marble shaft, or a mausoleum, or a memorial hall, or a charity home, but a church where charity and love for truth and all things beautiful are to be taught and illustrated for generations to come. It is to be at Edgbaston, Birmingham, where the gentle Cardinal lived for forty years, training the men who are there now, and imbuing them with his own spirit of devout and literary activity, to educate thousands of others in the highest culture of which man is capable.

More than this. The church at Birmingham is actually a dire need. As a correspondent, apparently not a Catholic himself, but caught by the noble fitness of the design to erect such a church, writes in a recent number of the New York *Sun:* "I am of the opinion that there are a great many who would contribute to the success of the Rev. Fr. Eaton, of the London Oratory, who is in this country for the purpose of raising funds with which to build a Roman Catholic Church at Birmingham, England, as a memorial to the late Cardinal John Henry Newman, in which city the latter spent so many years after his conversion. I am told the Catholics of Birmingham are quite poor. Cardinal Newman needs no introduction to those who know him through his writings, and I think there are many non-Catholics who would contribute to such a movement if it were generally made known."

In another part of this issue of the REVIEW, Father Eaton himself explains the purpose of his invitation. The names of the American contributors will be published in successive numbers together with the amounts realized. Subscribers will address their contributions directly to Father Eaton, at his temporary residence in Philadelphia. It may stimulate interest in the noble undertaking to learn that the Catholics of England have already shown their appreciation of the great Cardinal's work which is being continued in the Birmingham Oratory. Among the leading personages who have made offerings thus far are:

The Duke of Norfolk, K. C	$25,000
Mrs. Poncia	5,000
Anonymous	5,000
Mr. and Mrs. Lacy	2,500
C. C. Shaw, Esq.	1,500
W. H. Watts, Esq.	1,250
Mr. and Mrs. Hall	525
P. A. Martin, Esq.	525
F. W. Ratcliff, Esq.	525
T. W. Allies, Esq.	500
Anonymous	500
A. Clarke, Esq.	500
Mr. and Mrs. Feeney	500
T. Gaisford, Esq.	500
T. F. Hope, Esq.	500
Captain Rushbrooke	500
15 Donations of $250	3,750
3 " " 150	450
13 " " 125	1,625
Smaller Donations	11,350
Total (up to date)	$62,500

We shall gladly follow in the wake of those who thus honor the memory of Cardinal Newman. The movement can be productive only of the highest good. The church built in memory of the great Oratorian will add to the honor of God by facilitating a more fitting worship in His temple; but it will also direct the attention of those who have a high regard for the noble qualities of heart and mind which distinguished him, to the one purpose for which he lived and to which all his aims tended—that is, the finding of true peace in the home of the Catholic Church.

Ecclesiastical Library Table.

SACRED SCRIPTURE.

1. The Bible and Science.—Father Ferdinand Prat has contributed to the *Études* two articles[1] on the relative influence of progress and tradition on Catholic exegesis. He points out that the Catholic Bible student has to deal with a special form of an apparent opposition between science and faith, and that in order to do so successfully, he has to refurbish weapons supplied by the storehouse of tradition, but grown rusty through a partial disuse of centuries. St. Augustine and St. Thomas and the Council of Trent stated the Catholic principles of Biblical exegesis clearly enough; but almost immediately after the Council, when the famous Galileo case was considered by the Roman theologians, the Tridentine clause "in matters of faith, and of morals pertaining to the building up of Christian doctrine" was overlooked, and the Bible was practically regarded as a guide-book of scientific and historical research.

In the sixteenth century, Father Pereira[2] found in Genesis the whole of Pliny's natural history, of Aristotle's physics, and of Ptolemy's astronomy. In our own times, the Abbé Moigno believed that all the recent scientific discoveries were forestalled by the author of Genesis, and that the obscurity of several Scripture texts, which still remains, is due to the tardy progress of science. Here, too, belong most of the attempts of harmonizing the Bible with science, the name of which is "legion." Some of them stand refuted by their extravagance; thus, Le Pelletier[3] tried to show that Josue had added a day to the solar year by commanding the sun to stand still,[4] and that another ten days were added by Isaias' miracle on the sun-dial of Achaz.[5] The last-named of these miracles

[1] November 5, 1902, pp. 289–312; December 5, 1902, pp. 610–633.

[2] Bened. Pererii, Comment. in Gen., Romae, 1589.

[3] Astronomie biblique. Le Déluge, Josué, Ezéchias, curieuse concordance des trois plus prodigieux miracles de la Bible avec l'état present du ciel; Paris, 1867, 8vo, p. 39.

[4] Jos. 10: 12.

[5] IV Kings 20: 1–11; Isa. 38: 1–9; Ecclus. 48: 26.

has of late been explained in a more rational way by Professor Adolf Müller, of the Gregorian University, Rome.[6] The so-called Biblical cosmogony, too, has of late found an able exponent in the person of Professor Zapletal, of Freiburg, Switzerland.[7]

Albert Houtin[8] has certainly acted both cruelly and unfairly by throwing ridicule on these Catholic attempts to harmonize the Bible with our scientific and historical discoveries; there is no branch of knowledge that might be treated in the same way. At the same time, we cannot well endorse a system of exegesis which makes of Moses a Neptunian to-day, and a Plutonist to-morrow, according to the prevailing tendency of geology; which formerly viewed the inspired writers as adherents of Ptolemy, and now makes them forerunners of Copernicus; which, at one time, read in the first chapter of Genesis the cosmogony of Laplace, at another the hypothesis of Faye, and is now about to find in the same passage the theory of M. de Ligondès. And all these changes are not due to any discovery of new texts or readings; the discovery of the retrograde movement of the satellites, of Uranus and Neptune, and of the peculiar revolution of Phobos around Mars, and similar changes in purely secular sciences have occasioned all these passing phases in the field of Biblical exegesis. It is sinful to explain away a truth evidently contained in Sacred Scripture; but it is impious to pretend to find in Scripture a truth which God has not placed therein.

How, then, are we to remedy this evil? Father Prat is right in maintaining that no satisfactory solution of the difficulty can be found in the admission of Card. Newman's *obiter dicta*,[9] even were we to prescind from the question of their admissibility. Neither can we safely recur to Mgr. D'Hulst's theory of a mitigated form of inspiration in certain parts of the Bible which does not necessarily exclude all error;[10] we might as well try to bail out a boat

[6] L'arte gnomica e la Sacra Scrittura, studio apologetico sull 'orologio di Achaz, published in Memorie della Pontificia Academia dei Nuove Lincei, and also in Natur und Offenbarung, Bd. 48: 257–73; 340–55; 405–19.

[7] Der Schöpfungsbericht der Genesis 1: 1–2: 3. Mit Berücksichtigung der neuesten Entdeckungen und Forchungen erklärt. Freiburg, Schweiz, 1902; 8vo, v + 104.

[8] La Question Biblique chez les Catholics de France au xix. siècle; Paris, 1902.

[9] *Nineteenth Century*, February, 1884, p. 185 ff.

[10] *Correspondant*, January 25, 1893, pp. 220, 233.

by punching a hole in its bottom. Nor is there any need of declaring the position of the Catholic Bible student hopeless; the author who writes to this effect under the pseudonym Isidore Desprès[11] is prompted to do so more through wounded self-love than through love of truth.

Our true remedy is found in our return to tradition. Father Prat shows that St. Jerome regarded the Bible as a series of books whose expression and language were adapted to the readers of the respective ages for which they were written. They speak only of the sun, the moon, the morning star, and two or three constellations, so that they do not pretend to teach astronomy. They name only six metals, seven minerals, and fifteen precious stones, so that they do not pretend to teach mineralogy. About one hundred plants and one hundred animals are mentioned in the inspired books, so that they do not teach botany or zoology. In a word, the Bible is a religious book, or rather a collection of religious books, written in a popular style, in which scientific questions are not treated *ex professo*, but only by way of illustration, or as the medium of conveying higher truths. Father de Hummelauer, in his recent commentary on the Book of Josue, gives evidence that he fully agrees with the foregoing view.[12] Explaining the passage which tells of the standing still of the sun,[13] and which has puzzled so many commentators and has elicited so many different theories, he regards the narrative as merely giving the impression of Josue and those engaged in the battle. They were so absorbed in their work that they did not notice the coming up of a hail-cloud, and therefore they mistook the ensuing darkness for the twilight of evening. When the cloud had disappeared or discharged its contents on the heads of the Amorrhites, the combatants were struck at seeing the sun still high in the heavens, and their impression of a miraculous occurrence was the natural consequence.

Thus far, then, the Bible is a collection of books which teach religious truth *ex professo*, and mention scientific truths only incidentally, as means of expressing religious truth. There can be no difficulty about the principle of Catholic exegesis with regard to

[11] *Revue du Clergé*, June 1, 1900, p. 17.

[12] Commentarius in Librum Josue, Parisiis, 1903, P. Lethielleux.

[13] Jos. 10: 12 sq.; p. 234 f.

the first class of truth; the teaching of the Church, or the analogy of faith, or similar theological helps, guide the Catholic interpreter. And there is no more difficulty about the principle of Catholic exegesis regarding the second class of truths, or scientific truths, incidentally mentioned in the Bible. The Tridentine and the Vatican Councils are sufficiently clear on this point, though their teaching regarding it is rather implicit then explicit. But St. Augustine and St. Thomas are both clear and explicit on the question. They distinguish two domains of truth—the domain of faith and that of science; in the former the infallible teaching of the Church and tradition rule supreme; in the latter we depend on the representatives of science.[14] To illustrate this principle by a real occurrence: In the Galileo case the Roman theologians made a mistake in urging in a purely scientific question the popular language of the Bible against the testimony of a scientific expert; on the other hand, it was not the least of Galileo's mistakes that in his turn he endeavored to explain his own theories into the Bible and to represent all other theories as opposed to the Bible, as if Sacred Scripture did not occupy a level wholly different from that of science, and raised above it.

But has not the Catholic student to show that Sacred Scripture in its incidental scientific remarks is not opposed to the certain results of science; and, moreover, must he not investigate on scientific principles whether certain events related in the Bible are miraculous or natural? All this is perfectly true, but in none of these questions can there be any real opposition between science and the Bible. The reason is as simple as it is cogent: in all these investigations the Bible student has to take the certain results of science for his starting-point; hence his final verdict can no more be antagonistic to science than the conclusion of a syllogism can be opposed to the premises. The reader may verify in the concrete the foregoing statements by perusing the interesting and learned articles on "The Magi and the Star," contributed to THE DOLPHIN[15] by Professor Joseph V. Tracy. The author never attempts to construct his scientific facts from the data of the Bible, but he studies the latter in the light of the

[14] Cf. *Études*, November 5, 1902, p. 303 f.; notes 1, 2, 3, and note 1 on p. 304, give all the references.

[15] December, 1902; January, 1903.

former. A similar process of reasoning may be observed in the Very Rev. L. C. Casartelli's study on the Magi, published in the *Dublin Review*.[16]

Father Prat has been able to draw up four canons that are to guide the Catholic commentator in harmonizing the Bible with science: (*a*) The points of contact between science and revelation are few, and their points of coincidence are fewer still. It is mainly in the field of philosophy that revelation and science either coincide with or touch each other. (*b*) Since it is not the primary object of inspiration to communicate scientific knowledge as such, a commentary which finds scientific theories in the inspired book implies an error and a danger; an error in principle, and a danger for future apologists and commentators. (*c*) Since the religious character of the inspired writers entitles them to employ popular language in their statements of scientific facts and principles, they ought not to be charged with scientific errors where a similar charge could not be brought against popular writers working without the aid of divine inspiration. (*d*) In purely scientific questions, a Biblical passage admitting of several meanings must not be explained so as to contradict the certain results of science; on the other hand, the natural and proper sense of Sacred Scripture must be adhered to until the results of science render a figurative explanation necessary.

2. The Bible and History.—Thus far we have followed Father Prat in restoring tradition to its proper rights in the interpretation of those Biblical passages that coincide with or touch the data of science. But now the author maintains, and in this he agrees with the express teaching of the Encyclical *Providentissimus Deus*, that what has been said concerning the Bible's relation to science must be extended to its relation to history. And if, owing to the fact that we have become accustomed to see the data of modern science carried into our Biblical commentaries, it has become hard for us to realize that the six days of creation are no more closely connected with the strata of geology than with Aristotle's categories, many more of us on first seeing Father Prat's principles extended to the field of history will be tempted to exclaim "this saying is hard, and who can hear it." The saying is hard indeed, since the

[16] The Magi: A Footnote to Matthew 2: 1. *Dublin Review*, October, 1902, p. 362 ff.

bond between history and religion is much closer than that between science and religion. But at the same time, the saying is of the utmost importance, seeing that the progress made in history is much more solid and extensive than the progress in natural science. If Hugo Winckler's *Babylonische Kultur*,[17] had been published before Father Prat wrote his articles, he would no doubt have referred us to this pamphlet in order to give us an idea of the advance in historical studies. Up to a few years ago profane history dated, at best, back to the end of the seventh century B.C., and continuous history began only toward the end of the sixth century B.C. Profane history covered therefore some twenty-five or twenty-six centuries. But owing to the modern discoveries, the beginning of modern history has been pushed back another twenty-five or twenty-six centuries, so that the former starting-point of profane history has now become its centre.

Before proceeding to investigate the precise bearing of historical discoveries strictly so-called, we must warn the reader that there are also Biblical discoveries which bear directly on the text of the Bible or its interpretation. To render our meaning clear, we need only draw attention to the recently recovered Hebrew text of Ecclesiasticus which has been carefully edited by Professor Norbert Peters[18] and Father Knabenbauer,[19] to the recently recovered Syriac text of the Gospels, and to other similar finds. It would be unpardonable, were we to omit here the recent discovery of a Hebrew papyrus buried in Egypt, and dating from the first to the third century, A.D. According to present appearances, it is by far the most ancient Hebrew document extant, and as such is the object of the most intense interest. It contains the Ten Commandments and the so-called Shema, *i. e.*, Deut. 5 : 6–18 and 6 : 4–9. Mr. Stanley Cook, at the recent meeting of the British Society of Biblical Archæology, drew attention to the fact that this manuscript agrees in several points with the Septuagint version against the present Hebrew text. Thus after specialists shall have exploited the document in all its bearings,

[17] Leipzig, Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1902.

[18] Der jüngst wiederaufgefundene hebräische Text des Buches Ecclesiasticus untersucht, herausgegeben, übersetzt und mit kritischen Noten versehen ; Freiburg, Herder, 1902.

[19] Commentarius in Ecclesiasticum cum Appendice ; Parisiis, Lethielleux, 1902 ; pp. i. lxxxiii.

the Biblical commentator will proceed with greater assurance in his judgment on the relative value of the Greek and the Hebrew text of the Old Testament.

But recoveries like the foregoing are Biblical rather than historical. At present we have to do with the relation of the Bible to profane history strictly so-called. And in the first place, it should be noted that there is no reason why God should reveal an historical fact any more than a scientific fact. If we have been right therefore in maintaining that the Bible stated points of science only incidentally, as far as they are connected with religious truth, we must maintain the same position concerning historical truth as such. This view appears to be in full accord with the tradition of the Fathers and of the Synagogue. The latter divided the books of the Old Testament into the Law, the Prophets, and the Hagiographa, so that our so-called historical books of the Old Testament were partly classed among the Prophets, partly among the Hagiographa. History as mere history was not recognized. Hence it follows that our inspired books cannot be expected to contain complete histories of their respective periods.

Secondly, it must be expected that our inspired historical books are written in the peculiar style of their respective time of composition. On the whole it will not do to dogmatize on the special peculiarities prevalent in each particular book of Sacred Scripture; but if we divide the methods of writing history into three, that of compilation, that of elaboration, and that combining both, we shall see that the inspired historical books commonly follow the third or mixed method. In other words, the inspired historian sifts his documents with a view to the end he wishes to attain; he eliminates some, and combines, abbreviates, or reproduces others. We are not in the least prepared to agree with the Abbé Loisy's exaggerated views; but his four chapters on the parables in his *Études Évangeliques*[20] may illustrate the mixed method of writing history. Loisy believes that in the parabolic teaching of our Lord as set forth in the Synoptic Gospels we have indeed the original nucleus of Christ's own words, but overlaid by an Apostolic interpretation. In other words, the Synoptic parables are the seed not as it was cast by the Divine Sower, but in a condition in which it had already begun to germinate. As for us, we fail to

[20] Paris: Picard. 1902.

appreciate the reasons set forth in a recent Catholic review of Loisy's latest works[21] for emphasizing "the deep debt which Catholic Biblical students owe to him, whether they happen to agree with him or not."

In the third place, Father Prat shows quite conclusively that in our inspired historical books there occur so-called implied quotations, *i. e.*, that whole portions of these books are copied either from profane or inspired sources without any reference to the original document. Moreover, express references are more frequent in the later than in the earlier books; and still, it is not at all probable that the earlier books contain fewer quotations. Here then is a wide field for the critical acumen of the commentator. In certain instances, indeed, it may be easy enough to separate the original documents and to assign them to their proper source; but the majority of cases presents veritable riddles. By way of example, we may mention Dr. Radau's recent attempt to derive the so-called first account of the creation in Genesis, or Gen. 1, from a Sumerian source,[22] in which the Creation was represented as a natural process of generation. If the purely subjective element be taken away from this book, very few, if any, of Radau's conclusions will remain.

Fourthly, it is well known that an author does not always endorse the words he quotes. Hence the question, Do our inspired historians endorse their implicit quotations? Father Prat believes that we ought to defend the divine authority of all such quotations, whether they be known as such or not, until the contrary is proved. For this view of the case we may appeal to the unanimous voice of tradition.

Finally, to omit several rather minute investigations, it must be kept in mind that possibly, though not probably, some of our so-called histories may be mere allegories or parables. Father Prat mentions the Book of Judith especially; the reader knows that the Books of Tobias and of Jonas might be added; but here again tradition must be maintained till progress has rendered its position untenable. If this should ever happen, what would we lose? Here is Father Prat's answer: "From a religious point of view, nothing; from an historical point of view, very little."

[21] *L'Évangile et l'Église*, Paris: Picard, 1902; *Études Évangeliques*, Paris: Picard, 1902. [22] The Creation-Story of Gen. 1; Chicago, 1902.

Criticisms and Notes.

THE PART OF RHEIMS IN THE MAKING OF THE ENGLISH BIBLE. By James G. Carleton, D.D., Assistant Lecturer in Divinity, University of Dublin. Oxford: The Clarendon Press. 1902. Pp. vii—259. Price, 9s. 6d. net. $3.15.

The English Bible of 1611, commonly called the Authorized Version, was far from being an original translation of the Scriptures. Its authors expressly state that they followed the Bishops' Bible as a general rule, but they add: "These translations to be used when they agree better with the text . . . : Tindale's, Matthew's, Coverdale's, Whitchurch's, Geneva's." It will be noted that they omit all reference to the original English translation, that of Wickliffe, as well as to the version of the New Testament published at Rheims in 1582 for the benefit of English Catholics. Dr. Carleton accounts, we think plausibly, for the first omission by the practical obsoleteness of Wickliffe's English, except for a few phrases which Tyndale had adopted. The other omission is more difficult to explain. For reference is made more than once to the Catholic translation in the Preface entitled 'The Translators to the Reader,' which comments on certain statements made in the Preface to the Rheims New Testament. Perhaps the true reason for silence may lie in the controversial disinclination on the part of the Protestant editors to admit that "any good thing" could "come out of the Nazareth" of despised and rejected Catholicism.

However that may be, it is now generally admitted by competent judges [*e. g.*, the compilers of the Revised New Testament (1881) in their Preface] that the Rheims version exercised a strong influence on the Authorized translation. It is the laudable object of the present work "to estimate and define, as accurately as possible, the degree of that influence."

In order to accomplish this design thoroughly the author has not only made exhaustive comparisons between the English Bible of 1611 and the Rheims version, but he has collated all the preceding translations, except Wickliffe's.

He begins his survey with an interesting historical account, admirable alike for its brevity, clearness, and wealth of material, of the earlier versions of Tyndale, Coverdale, Matthew, Taverner, Cranmer, Whittingham, Tomson, that published at Geneva in 1560, and the celebrated Bishops' Bible, a revision of the Great Bible entrusted by Parker to episcopal scholars. He concludes the series with a ten-page account of the Rheims Testament, followed by a short history of the Authorized Version which owed so much to it.

Cardinal Allen's connection with the Seminary established at Douay in 1568 is well known. The College of Rheims was an offshoot of the older foundation, the professors and students (several of them graduates of the English Universities) having been compelled to remove from Douay to Rheims in 1578. They occupied their time by taking in hand, under the patronage of Cardinal Allen (whose reputation for Scriptural knowledge stood so high that he was chosen by Cardinal Carafa to assist him in his amended edition of the LXX intended to be a beginning of a complete version of the Latin Vulgate), an English translation of the New Testament for the use of Catholics. A letter by Cardinal Allen in which he dwells on the difficulty in preaching effectively owing to the only authorized version of the Scriptures being in Latin, and expresses his willingness to undertake "a faithful, pure, and genuine version of the Bible in accordance with the edition approved by the Church," has assigned to it by Dr. Carleton 1580 as its date. If this be correct, the scheme had already passed from the region of contemplation, for a marginal entry in the Douay Diaries of the year 1578 states that 'On October 16th . . . Martin, Licentiate (of Theology), began a translation of the Bible into English, with the object of healthfully counteracting the corruptions whereby the heretics have so long lamentably deluded almost the whole of our countrymen.' This controversial purpose of the new revision is also plainly set forth in the Preface (which condemns unsparingly the post-Reformation translations of the Scriptures), as well as in the general tenure of the notes. Gregory Martin, the chief author of the Rheims version, was a scholar of St. John's College, Oxford, and a capable Greek scholar—an accomplishment of which he made use in his translation which, while designedly based on the Vulgate, was considerably influenced by a first-hand examination of the original text. This is especially evidenced by the number of cases in which the Rheims Testament inserts or omits the definite article, a point about which the earlier versions were conspicuously

careless. The other sources mentioned generally in the Preface include some of the English translations as well as 'other editions in divers language.' Bishop Westcott has pointed out how much stronger is the resemblance than the difference between the Rhemish translation and Tyndale's English Bible. The great disfigurement of the former is its multitude of Latin words which make it oftentimes rough and grotesque, when not actually unintelligible, *e.g.*, 'He exinanited Himself' (Phil. 2: 7); 'Against the spirituals of wickedness in the celestials' (Eph. 6: 12); 'Odible to God' (Rom. 1: 30); 'The proposition of loaves' (Heb. 9: 2); etc.

The Translation with Preface and Annotations was published at Rheims in 1582. Many copies are still extant. A second edition, the same except for alterations in the notes, appeared in 1600. Finally, the complete Bible was published at Douay in 1609–10. The annotations on the Douay Old Testament from the hand of Dr. Worthington, the President, are fewer and less combative than those on the New Testament.

Turning next to the Authorized Version, Dr. Carleton considers it most probable that the compilers knew the Rheims translation through Fulke's contemporaneous work upon it. That writer printed in parallel columns the Bishops' Bible and the Catholic Version, and to this fact was 'due indirectly the degree of influence which the Rhemish Testament has exerted upon the construction of the English Bible.'

In the second section of his treatise, Dr. Carleton adopts the analytical method of demonstrating the important position of the Rheims Version, "as a liberal contribution to the storehouse of the English Bible," not only in its vocabulary, but in grammatical distinctness, and even in the structure of its sentences. His plan is remarkable for its thoroughness. In the first place, he compared the Authorized Version (designated A.) with the Bishop's Bible. When any difference appeared, he consulted the Rhemish Version (designated R.). If he found that R. agreed with A., he next examined the earlier translations, Cranmer's, the Genevan, etc. When none of these showed the rendering common to A. and R., he assumed that A. must have borrowed from R., and inserted the joint-reading in the first column of Table I, placing in the second column the readings of the earlier versions. He adopts the same methods with regard to the marginal readings of A.

The objection will at once be made that the similarity af the two

renderings may be no more than a coincidence. A. and R. may conceivably have gone to a common source, or independently have arrived at the same conclusion. But an examination of Dr. Carleton's exhaustive Table makes it plain that the arguments are so many, so repeated (sometimes verse after verse being identical), as to make it almost a certainty—the author, however, does not say more than that the evidence is presumptive—that the coincidences must point to a borrowing from one version by the compilers of the other.

To give a few instances in point:

(*a*) And first as to the influence of the Latin Vulgate derived from the Rhemish version. Some of the most striking instances are seen in Mark 4: 12, where "be converted" (convertantur) has taken the plaee of "turn;" in Mark 8: 19, 20, Luke 9: 17, John 6: 13, where "broken meat" is replaced by "fragments" (fragmenta); in Matt. 10: 26, John 1: 31, 14: 21, Rom. 2: 5, etc., where famine (fames) is found instead of the Saxon "dearth;" in Matt. 10: 15, 11: 22, where "more tolerable" (tolerabilius) is preferred to "easier," and 1 Tim. 4: 15, where "incontinent" (incontinentes) stands for "riotous."

Again, both Versions follow the Vulgate in reproducing a Greek word, *e. g.*, hymn, sycamore, austere, Areopagite, mysteries, schism.

A third way in which the Vulgate has filtered through R. to A. is seen in the literal translation of Latin phrases, such as "took care of him" (ἐπεμελήθη ἀυτοῦ) in Luke 10: 34; "be it far from thee" (Ἵλεως σοι) in Matt. 16: 22, "to make known the mystery" (γνωρίσαι τὸ μυστριον) in Ephes. 6: 19.

(*b*) *English instead of Latin words*, where R., contrary to its usual practice, prefers a Saxon word, or Saxon compounds, to their Latin equivalent. Thus we have "blessing" in place of "lauding" in Luke 24: 53; "stock" for "generation" in Acts 13: 26; "building" for "edification" in Jude 20; "stirred up" for "moved" in Acts 6: 12, etc.; and "taken away" for "exalted" in Acts 8: 33.

(*c*) *Modernizations.* So "moisture" is adopted by A. from R. in place of "moistness" (Luke 8: 6), "cutting himself" for "all to cutting himself" (Mark 5: 5), "outside" for "utterside" (Matt. 23: 25); "musick" for "minstrelsy" (Luke 15: 25), "distresses" for "anguishes" (2 Cor. 12: 10); and "adorned" for "did tyre" (1 Peter 3: 5).

(*d*) *Archaisms—e. g.*, "if haply" replacing "to see if" or "whether" (Mark 11: 13); "foretell" instead of "tell before" (2

Cor. 13 : 2); "without" instead of "out of" (Heb. 13 : 13); "thereof" instead of "of it" (Rev. 21 : 23).

(*e*) *Improvements.* As regards vocabulary, "came" (ἐλθών) for "went" (Matt. 4 : 13); "gather" (συνάγουσι) for "carry;" "worketh" (κατεργάζεται) for "doth" (Rom 2 : 10); "helps, governments" (ἀντιλήψεις, κυβερνήσεις) for "helpers, governors" (1 Cor. 12 : 28); and "repay" (ἀποτίσω) for "recompense" (Phil. 19).

In giving force to the Greek article, we read "the furnace" (Matt. 13 : 50); "the wind" (Ib. 14 : 30); "the truth" (Col. 1 : 5); "the heavens" (Heb. 4 : 14); "the . . . manna" (Apoc. 2 : 17).

Similarly, attention, lacking in earlier versions, is paid to the Greek particle δέ, *e. g.*, Mark 12 : 29; Luke 1 : 6; 18 : 15.

(*f*) *Changes for the worse, e. g.*, "the abundance" is no bettering of "superfluity" (Mark 12 : 44 and Luke 21 : 4); "full time" unduly emphasizes the earlier "time" (Luke 1 : 57); "might be rich" is an obvious blunder for "might be *made* rich" (2 Cor. 8 : 9) and "who now rejoice" for "now rejoice I" (1 Tim. 6 : 7).

Dr. Carleton descends to the letter N in his analysis of the points of agreement between the Authorized and Rhemish Versions, but we think we have shown sufficiently how well he has succeded in his object. His work is as thorough, exhaustive, and complete as the most exacting critic could demand. It is not a little interesting that a non-Catholic scholar should essay to prove with such ability and success, how much the Authorized Version (the cadence of whose rhythm Newman declared to have haunted him for years after his conversion) owes to the oftentimes despised Rheims Translation. Those who are never tired of lauding the one to the skies as the greatest monument of English literature, will not, we hope, after reading this elaborate treatise, forget in the future to give its due meed of praise to the Version that remains a standing witness to the attainments of our Catholic forefathers, which the compilers of the Authorized Version used so freely and thanked so sparingly.

PEPLOGRAPHIA DUBLINENSIS: Memorial Discourses Preached in the Chapel of Trinity College, Dublin, 1895-1902. London: Macmillan & Co. New York: The Macmillan Co. 1902. Pp. viii—219. Price, 5s.

Under a not particularly illuminative title (at least to the unclassical reader) Dean Bernard has edited a series of discourses on departed worthies of Trinity College, Dublin, by their modern suc-

cessors. Dr. Dowden, the Bishop of Edinburgh, preaches on Archbishop Ussher of chronological fame; Professor Gwynn on the less well-known Bishop Wilson; Dr. Bernard himself on the famous Idealist, Bishop Berkeley; Professor Mahaffy on Bishop Stearne (a not very congenial subject); Professor Lawlor on Archbishop King; the Bishop of Derry, Dr. Chadwick, on Edmund Burke; Canon Sherlock on Henry Grattan; and Mr. Westropp Roberts on Viscount Falkland.

The figures chosen for homiletic praise are sufficiently representative. One misses at once Dean Swift and Oliver Goldsmith; but the editor consoles us in the preface by hinting that they may receive recognition at a future date.

Turning to Archbishop Ussher and Bishops Berkeley and Wilson as the best known among the ecclesiastics, and to Burke and Grattan as the most famous of the laymen, we find in each case a careful biography, giving the leading events of their respective lives, followed by an analysis of their characters, an enumeration of their virtues, and a catalogue of their good deeds, ending usually with a practical conclusion to the hearers to "go and do likewise" in their several degrees. Thus an account of Archbishop Ussher's prodigious learning, which acts as a foil to a narration of the prominent events of his life, leads up to the practical exhortation to Trinity men to imitate the thoroughness of his works by giving a full historical treatment, not a mere "perplexing patchwork of disconnected shreds and scraps selected from the rag-bag of second-hand learning," of the "several distinctive doctrines and practices of the Church of Rome."

Provost Salmon's monumental work on the *Infallibility of the Church* (of which some one has wittily said that from the destructive nature of its subject-matter, the *Fallibility of the Church* would have been a more appropriate title), comes in for special praise in this connection.

The discourse on Bishop Berkeley is remarkable for its clever summary of the chief features of the philosophy associated with his name. We have seldom seen a better exposition in the compass of so few words. "Berkeley declared," writes Dr. Bernard, "that when people speak of 'matter,' they speak of what no man can understand, for the word has no meaning at all. Sights and sounds, tastes and smells, these are the realities with which we are concerned; but to affirm the existence of something beyond and behind the qualities which can be perceived by the senses, is to use words without any

ideas corresponding to them, and this is the universal blunder of speculative writers, who 'first raise a dust and then complain that they cannot see.'"

But the learned Dean is surely carried away by admiration for his hero when he goes on to state that Berkeley's "relentless logic," whereby he demolished the thesis that matter apart from its qualities (and by qualities are meant the "proper objects" of the senses) has a real, objective existence, is "still unanswered."

The treatment of Burke and Grattan by their respective panegyrists is sympathetic and highly eulogistic. The former is praised by Dr. Chadwick for the brilliance of his literary style, the moving fire of his eloquence, the sage statesmanship of his political counsels. Incidentally, Trinity men will be interested to learn that he was the founder of the College Historical Society, analogous to the "Union" at Oxford and Cambridge. Henry Grattan's political life is divided into two parts—his attempt to obtain the independence of the Irish Parliament, and that to win the Emancipation of his Catholic fellow-countrymen. Both efforts were successful, the one temporarily, the other up to the present day. It is instructive and refreshing to find an Irish Protestant clergyman denouncing the "unblushing corruption" and the "treacherous policy" which brought about the Act of Union of 1800; and still more so to read in his pages that the penal laws were "utterly vicious and unjust." Canon Sherlock observes furthermore with "pardonable pride" that "Irish Protestants took the lead in this matter of Emancipation," and that "the students of Trinity College presented an address to Grattan (in 1795), thanking him for his exertions in the Cause, while the University itself was the first to open her doors and admit to her honors members of the Roman Catholic Faith." And he goes on to adorn his tale with a moral, especially useful in view of a recent burning controversy. "It still remains," he writes, "a reproach to the Protestants and the Legislature of the United Kingdom, that Roman Catholics are refused a University of their own: a refusal which Grattan more than a century ago denounced as an act of injustice, and a denial of Christian charity. I believe that this refusal is not by the wish of the great mass of English Protestants; it is certainly not by that of Irish Protestants."

This discourse is one of the ablest and most fascinating in the book. The others vary considerably in interest and merit. Professor Mahaffy, in particular, is not by any means at his best on a subject with which he cannot have much in common; and Mr. Westropp

Roberts' contribution on Viscount Falkland might have been omitted without any serious loss. But the book, taken as a whole, has many features of interest, and we hope it may be sufficiently successful to ensure the publication of a fresh series of illustrious *alumni* of an illustrious *Alma Mater*.

THE REVELATION OF THE HOLY SPIRIT. By J. E. C. Welldon, D.D., Canon of Westminster Abbey; Lately Bishop of Calcutta and Metropolitan of India and Ceylon. New York: The Macmillan Co. Pp. vii—384. Price, 6s.

It is to be feared that devotion to the Holy Ghost does not form so important a part in the spiritual life as should properly be the case. The dearth of literature on the subject would, at least, point to that conclusion. Any work, therefore, even from a non-Catholic source, that attempts to bring home the nature and office of the Third Person of the Blessed Trinity, must be welcomed in so far as its theology is sound. Love springs from knowledge, and the more the mind knows of the Holy Spirit, the greater will be the attraction of the heart and will towards His blessed influence.

The treatise before us is in the main well calculated to produce this effect. It is purposely couched in non-technical language, and for that reason should find its way to the bookshelves of an intelligent laity averse to the abstract metaphysical subtleties of the school, who yet are eager to know the principles of a doctrine so practical in its bearing on the life of the soul as that of the Holy Spirit's presence and work in the world.

Having stated the scope of his work to be an examination of the teaching of Christ and His Apostles on the subject of the Holy Ghost, and thence "to determine what light it throws on the religious problems of the modern Christian world," Dr. Welldon begins by an elaborate exposition of Old Testament passages on (*a*) the creative or life-giving energy of the Spirit of God with reference to the physical universe, to man, to natural beauty, prosperity, and happiness; (*b*) the Holy Spirit as the author of intellectual ability in its various form —artistic, administrative, etc.; (*c*) the Holy Spirit as the author of prophecy; (*d*) the Holy Spirit as the author of holiness. The absence of His special designation as the "*Holy* Spirit," from the Old Testament (except for a passing reference in the Psalms), which appellative is constantly met with in the New Testament, is cited to illustrate the lower moral conception of His nature before the advent

of Christ. The list of texts quoted is practically exhaustive. Their general force is shown to teach approximately the Personality of the Holy Ghost as the author of life, "the interpreter of the Divine Will, the unique source of light and liberty." For, although the author hesitates to say that the Holy Spirit is as clearly taught in the Old Testament to be a Person as He is an energy, he is compelled later to admit that Isaias "speaks of the Spirit in terms so personal as to forbid the thought of . . . metaphor."

The subsequent chapters on the revelation concerning the Holy Spirit in the Gospels, the Acts, and the Epistles, make interesting reading, although hardly so full in treatment as the chapter which we have been considering. We would single out for special praise the lessons drawn from the simile of "the wind" in our Lord's conversation with Nicodemus, viz., the mysterious character of the Holy Spirit, His regenerative action, and His consecrating influence. The analysis of the narrative, in Acts 2, of the events on the Day of Pentecost, is also well done. And the author rightly insists more than once upon the reality of the Holy Spirit's work in the world in changing the whole tone of morality, so that the grosser forms of sin, such as are described in Dr. Döllinger's *Das Heidenthum und Judenthum*,[1] once looked upon as natural and even connected with the religious rites of Isis and Aphrodite, have been banished from the sight of men.

The least satisfactory part of the book is that concerned with the relation of the Holy Ghost to the Christian Church. Bishop Welldon seems to have no conception of the indwelling presence of the Paraclete and Illuminator in the Body of Christ as its perpetual Teacher and Guide, the unfailing source of its grace and life. Yet we must in fairness admit that there is an excellent passage on the Power of the Keys, in which it is stated in language as plain as could be desired that, "according to our Lord's explicit promise, the gift of the Holy Spirit conveys to the Church as a body, and to her priests as her representatives, the power of pronouncing, or refusing to pronounce, the forgiveness of sins."

The value of the treatise is marred by the latitudinarian leanings of the author, shown notably in belittling the *Filioque* clause, in

[1] See, too, J. A. Froude's essay on *Origen and Celsus*:—"The world has never seen . . . such a condition of human society as prevailed in the Roman Empire . . . between the Crucifixion and the conversion of Constantine . . . Moral good and evil were fancies merely, with no bearing on life." Dr. Julius Koch in his *Roman History* gives similar testimony as to social conditions at the time of Augustus.

minimizing the extent of Inspiration, in making the true conception of the Atonement "analogical," and in ranking the dogma of Eternal Punishment among "stern beliefs characteristic of a worn-out theology." Although it cannot hope to take the place in any degree of Cardinal Manning's works on the Temporal and Internal Missions of the Holy Ghost—works as full of accurate theology as they are truly devotional—it may do some good in arousing interest in the Person and work of the Blessed Spirit of God among those who forget His Presence and gifts, and from forgetfulness fail in love and gratitude towards Him.

RICH AND POOR IN THE NEW TESTAMENT. By Orello Cone, D.D. London: Adam & Charles Black. Pp. viii—245.

This painstaking treatise on the teaching of the New Testament as regards the relation of rich to poor, may be best described, in the words of the sub-title, as "A Study of the Primitive-Christian Doctrine of Earthly Possessions." In a preliminary chapter, Dr. Cone sketches the social conditions that existed among the Jews before Christ, and the main outline of Old Testament teaching on wealth and poverty. He adopts incidentally the position of the higher critics, represented by Dr. Driver, on the question of the authorship and dates of several of the Sacred Books, and draws extensively on German writers like Bertholet, Weizsäcker, and Buhl. Humane treatment of the poor is shown to have been strictly enjoined by the Levitical Law, notwithstanding the permission of slavery. God (or *Yahweh*, as Dr. Cone prefers to call Him) was regarded, in the words of Hannah, as He "who maketh poor and maketh rich."

In the following chapters, which form the best part of the book, Christ's own teaching concerning the social problem arising from poverty and wealth, is delineated exhaustively, in so far as the Synoptic evangelists are in question. For all reference to the Fourth Gospel is, for obvious reasons, conspicuous by its absence. Here, also, as in the earlier chapter, the author is too fond of digressions on the critical value of the sacred writings. So long as he confines himself to a summary of the point of view of Jesus as to the responsibilities and dangers of wealth and the dignity of poverty, he is admirable. He wastes no words; there are no purple patches of homiletic rhetoric; we feel, when we have done, that little remains to be said. We like particularly the allusion to the refrain of the Magnificat—one "that sounds throughout the entire Gospel" of St. Luke—the note of sym-

pathy with the poor; and the reference to Christ's own life of perpetual poverty. The remaining chapters on the Acts and the Epistles are of a slighter character and of a lower calibre. We cannot agree that St. Paul's "ascetic view of life, grounded on his doctrine of the flesh," combined with "limited perspective," tend to make his feeling towards the material concerns of the world, on the whole, one of indifference and depreciation.

The author cannot be followed in his exegesis of the parable of the "rich man," to whom God said, "Thou fool, this night shall thy soul be required of thee," and of Dives. He takes them, in conjunction with our Lord's hard saying—"It is easier for a camel to go through the eye of a needle than for a rich man to enter into the kingdom of God"—to mean a condemnation of wealth *qua* wealth, instead of the *abuse* of wealth—a very different thing. Because money brings in its train a variety of temptations, its possessor finds the road to Heaven rougher than the poor man without *impedimenta;* but that does not make it impossible for a rich man to avoid a selfish use of his money. "Crescunt dona: crescunt etiam rationes donorum," as St. Gregory says; "when gifts increase, the responsibilities of gifts increase in like ratio." The man endowed with ten talents was rewarded with the charge of ten cities because he corresponded with his obligations, while his companion with five talents had to be content with a lesser reward. "To every one that hath shall be given" is a law of Gospel morality, and it is inexplicable on the hypothesis that the possession of wealth *in se* is sinful. Christ preached no socialistic creed. He was no popular demagogue denouncing capitalism as a crime, inciting laborers against their hirers—in an important parable (that of the Vineyard) He actually adopts, without a word of protest, the class distinctions of the age—the wage-earners against the moneyed aristocracy. He fed the multitude when they were hungry, but not by bidding them raid the neighboring towns. It is true that in the Beatitudes poverty is exalted, wealth depreciated; just as in the Magnificat the rich are "sent away empty," the hungry "filled with good things." But it is to miss the whole point of Christ's social teaching to apply such words to the mere *material* well-being of men. He never failed to preach the superiority of the soul over the body—the life of the spirit, immortal, eternal, over the fleeting life of the flesh. "Is not the life more than the meat?" is His pregnant question, giving the key to His entire doctrine. The reference in the Beatitudes is to a spiritual, not

a physical, state. Detachment from creatures, "emptiness" of all earthly gifts, brings with it a heavenly and unending reward. Christ made His own the maxim of an ancient sage: The truly happy man is not the richest, but he who can do with the fewest possessions. He fostered no radical or revolutionary upheaval of existing society. The poor were to be content with their poverty, the rich to make good use of their wealth. The one class had to bear in mind that they were not forgotten by God ("the cries of the defrauded entered into the ears of Jehovah"); [1] the other that, if their obligations were great, the reward for a right correspondence with them was greater; both, not to set their affections upon things of earth, remembering that "the fashion of this world passeth away."

A minor point of criticism is the unnecessary sneer at the Church's supposed change of front on the principles that govern usury.

The author concludes an interesting work with some wise words on the non-existence of a magic "cure" for the misery and sufferings of poverty. "The effective remedy will be found to be, not a new system, but a new spirit; and a spirit proceeds neither by magic nor by leaps and bounds."

CONTRIBUTION PHILOSOPHIQUE À L'ÉTUDE DES SCIENCES. Par Le Chanoine Jules Didiot, des Facultés Catholiques de Lille. Lille: Desclée. 1902. Pp. xiv—302.

Canon Didiot's name will probably be associated in the minds of many of our readers with a superior *Cours de Theologie*, constructed on the lines of a philosophical system and entitled accordingly *Logique*, *Metaphysique*, *Morale Surnaturelle*. The present work is a philosophical study of the notions underlying and pervading the sciences. It is not an elementary introduction either to philosophy or to the sciences, it is rather the complement of both,—an ontological and a psychological development thereof, addressing itself primarily to the professor and the advanced student. Its purpose is to contribute to the mutual conciliation of metaphysical and physical science by a thorough explanation of their common grounds and a clear presentation of their reciprocal obligations. The lines on which the study proceeds are the following:

The object matter, both of the sciences and of philosophy, is either some *being* or some form of *action* or movement. An analytic exposi-

[1] St. James.

tion of these object spheres constitutes the two main divisions of the work. Being, the first subject matter, is either substance or accident, infinite or finite. The finite is either spiritual or corporeal.

Corporeal *substance* manifests itself as composed of an undifferentiated principle, which is the root of quantity, extension and number, and a differentiating principle, the root of unity and activity. The complete individual substance is the supposite or person. *Accidental* being is realized most universally in movement, which is either mechanical and transitive from an agent to a patient, or vital and imminent in the agent producing it. With a synthetic exposition of the philosophy of vital activity, the first chapter of the book closes and the way is prepared for an analytic study of the nature of matter, living and non-living, the human person, and of higher spiritual being. In these "special questions" the theory of metaphysical being is seen in application to its more restricted physical environment. A parallel treatment is accorded to the category of *action*, that is, the philosophy of action,—its elements, its kinds and laws,—is presented synthetically and then analytically pursued in specialized conditions, as physical, chemical, physiological, cognitive, and appetitive in man and as it is realized in the spiritual world transcending the human. It is these studies of metaphysical concepts in their physical setting that constitute the peculiar merit of the work and make it very much more than a synopsis of ontology, such as might be found in the average manual of scholastic philosophy. We select by way of illustration the treatment of organic evolution. The author shows that the philosopher and the scientist approach the subject from different standpoints, and find in it different problems. The philosopher is but secondarily concerned with the subdivisions, the genus and species, into which biology classifies living forms. The *plant* and the *animal* are for him the two *species* of the *genus organized body*. What he is primarily interested in knowing is whether these specific limits are or can be transgressed by the forces at work in nature. Has the mineral ever become a plant, or a plant an animal, or an animal a man? This is the question as philosophy views it, and the negative answer to which it finds not much difficulty in establishing, by an appeal, not to *morphology*, but to the *functions* and operations which manifest an essential difference between the various so-called kingdoms, or *philosophical species* of nature. The biological sciences, however, face another problem and view it from a different standpoint. What they want to know is whether *morphological* evolution is indefinitely possible; whether the

inorganic molecule has been able of itself to become a living cell; whether minerals have been able to transform themselves into plants, these into animals, and finally into men.

The physical sciences are interested in the range and processes of the evolutive power in nature. The investigations of comparative physiology and biology are useful to determine the conditions and variations of that power; but the importance of these factors must not be exaggerated, nor should it be supposed that reason and faith have been imperilled, if it should be demonstrated that an animal of a lower organization has been raised to the dignity of a monkey in the zoölogical army. The stages of progressive development in the embryo, the transition of obscure larva and nymphs into brilliant butterflies furnish authentic specimens, philosophically harmless, of these morphological changes, the importance whereof for the philosophical and religious interpretation of the origins of the living world are not infrequently exaggerated.

Philosophy would love, indeed, to have clear information on the reasons and conditions of the evolutive power at work in nature. Unfortunately, it must be content with guesses at the riddle, and wait till the sciences furnish fuller data. It may well be, however, that the solution will be found in the *spontaneity* of the intrinsic vital movement. Spontaneity under favorable conditions increases the perfection of the living being. Contrariwise, if it be thwarted, or restricted by unfavorable conditions. Vital spontaneity always develops for *good* or for *ill*. If for good, the result is never the specific *transformation* of the organism, neither from a lower to a higher nor from a higher to a lower genus, or species. If for *ill*, the result again will not be a transformation of nature, but a gradual exhaustion and death. And so, the author concludes, evolution occurs solely within the limits of the accidental, and never transgresses the essential.

The foregoing brief sketch of the treatment of the evolutionary problem may serve to suggest at least the purpose and method of the book as a whole. It brings to the front matters that are common to philosophy and the sciences. It differentiates carefully their distinctive view-points, and it indicates the ways in which they are mutually supplemental. It may be too much to expect, though it were earnestly to be hoped for, that non-Catholic philosophers and scientists will pay much attention to the work. The Catholic student and professor, whether of theology, philosophy, or science, however, and

indeed every cultured mind that feels an interest in the unification of knowledge, should give the volume a careful study. It does not, of course, contain the last word on its subject, but it is a distinctive and a valuable contribution thereto.

VIRGIL'S ÆNEID. Edited by Henry S. Frieze. Revised by Walter Dennison. Books I-XII. New York, Cincinnati, Chicago: American Book Company. 1902. Pp. 328. Half-leather, 12mo. Price, $1.50.

CICERO'S LAELIUS DE AMICITIA. Edited by Clifton Price, Ph.D. New York, Cincinnati, Chicago: American Book Company. Pp. 168. 12mo. Price, 75 cents.

Both these books are primarily adapted for use in the class-hall, and are each accordingly equipped with the pertinent apparatus of notes, illustrations, etc. We call attention to these here as convenient aids to the student who has outgrown the pupilage period, yet still cherishes a love for the Mantuan singer and the Maestro of Latin speech. The point of excellence in this edition of the Æneid is that it presents in convenient size and large clear letterpress the entire epic, together with abundant annotations, and an adequate vocabulary. It is, therefore, just the volume the lover of Virgil will want to have near to hand on his reading-table.

The present edition of Cicero's *De Amicitia* commends itself for its copious notes, its handiness, and material attractiveness. It lacks only a vocabulary to make it a perfect and independent *vade mecum.*

Literary Chat.

McMurry's *Special Method in Reading*, of the "Complete English Classics," gives valuable assistance to teachers in the treatment, particularly, of primary reading and oral recitation of stories. Catholic teachers may deem it wise to make other selections than those which are currently considered specimens of the best literature in our language; but they will profit their pupils if they note the superior methods in vogue in many of the common schools. Teachers in Religious Communities require this suggestive help all the more because the very earnestness and concentrated activity to which their lives are given, confirm them in certain traditional methods of reading and reciting which never strike them as peculiar or weak, because they are accustomed to them in those to whom they have looked up for similar instruction. Everybody is familiar with the sing-song style of some of the convent-grade performances, which, like certain national modes of inflection in reading and speaking, per-

petuate themselves unconsciously. If it be argued that this is only a matter of secondary importance, provided we attend to the education of the intellectual faculties and of the heart in the training in Christian principles; or if it be urged that the peculiarity of elocutionary exercise is unavoidable, because the nuns living in community and apart from the public cannot be expected to have those habits of popular address which belong to the platform or stage,—we should answer that, if the perfection of public utterance is of secondary importance as an endowment of character, it is, like all external manner and form, a very powerful and therefore important means of attracting those whom we would influence by those gifts of character which education is supposed to develop. And that in itself is a part of perfect education.

The last number (Vol. XXXII, part 3) of the *Journal of the Royal Society of Antiquaries of Ireland* contains an interesting sketch of "Derry Columkille," that is, the old "oak grove" in the midst of which the Saint established his monastery in 546, and where now stands the city whose inhabitants still religiously honor the memory of the holy founder by displaying the "oak leaf."

Sands & Company have just published *Anchoresses of the West.* The same firm has in press *The Monasteries of Great Britain* (with appendix for America) by Francesca M. Steele, who formerly wrote under the pseudonym of "Darley Dale." An article in this number of THE DOLPHIN, entitled "Prisoners of Love," which deals with the history of Recluses, is by the same author, who is already known to our readers by her *Convents of Great Britain* (Sands & Co., London, and B. Herder, St. Louis, Mo.).

The Clarendon Press (Oxford) announces the fourth volume of the Oxford History of Music—*The Age of Bach and Handel*, by Sir Hubert Parry. The work is likely to prove of special interest to students of sacred music.

The Althea, published from the Convent of the Holy Child at Sharon Hill, maintains its unique character as a school publication. The originality, freshness, and exquisite taste, shown alike in the contents and form of the magazine, are the best indication of the superior training given by the nuns, who made a singular record in England for thoroughness in educational work.

Two new Dictionaries of the Irish Language are in preparation and likely to be issued in the course of the present year. Father Dinneen's work, already spoken of, is expected to be ready in the fall. Mr. O'Neill Lane, of Limerick, is engaged upon an English-Irish Dictionary intended to be helpful to students who wish to translate English works into modern Irish (*The Gael*).

Dr. Atkinson, President of the Royal Irish Academy, is being badly criticized by the Irish scholars of Germany. It appears that the recent edition of the Brehon Laws, made by Dr. Atkinson, is full of glaring mistakes, showing a lack of Irish scholarship. Mr. Whitley Stokes, who writes in the *Zeitschrift für Celtische Philologie*, drawing attention to the errors of the edition, is warmly seconded by Professor Zimmer, Nuno Meyer, and other Continental Celtic students, and the Brehon Law

Commission is being urged to take steps to have the edition subjected to revision. In this they are supported by other members of the Academy and men of unquestioned authority on such matters, such as Dr. Edmund Hogan, and Father Peter O'Leary.

Professor Gardner's *Ancient Athens*, recently issued by the Macmillans, is probably the most satisfactory work on an historic subject—becoming daily more popular, that we possess in any language. It avoids the lengthy quotations from threadworn authorities, and gives the reader an accurate and direct impression derived from exact knowledge enlivened by personal observation. The author was, for some years, Director of the British School at Athens, and also Professor of Archæology in London University, and his information is first hand. The volume is well-illustrated, for the most part by Athenian artists of ability.

The *Divina Commedia* is at last being translated into Welsh, with illustrations by Mr. Edwards, the Welsh artist, who has gone to Florence for the purpose of sketching original sites in the old haunts of Dante.

We have a communication from Mr. Montgomery Carmichael, who has been called the first living English authority on the subject of St. Francis of Assisi. Mr. Carmichael takes exception to our criticism of his exquisite translation of the *Sacrum Commercium*, or rather of his Preface, in which, after referring to the fact that the author of the original work used the Latin Vulgate for his Scriptural quotations, Mr. Carmichael says—"To be faithful, therefore, I could not take my quotations straight from the 'Authorized Version.'" This expression which conveys the idea that the reader of a distinctly Catholic work might expect a translator to use the Protestant "Authorized Version," seemed to us a needless apology, and one undignified in a Catholic translator, even if we allow that this mediæval gem in its translated form would appeal to enlightened Protestants not less than to devout Catholics. Mr. Carmichael protests against our interpretation. That he is a Catholic deeply attached to his faith is evident from his published works, notably his Introduction to that charming (though fictitious) history of the inner Life of John William Walshe, the English edition of which was reviewed in these pages some months ago. Nevertheless it remains a fact that the Protestant "Authorized Version," whilst its English rhythm and choice of expression is in many ways superior to the Challoner version presently in use among Catholics, is in all respects, except its doctrinal mutilations, a mere reproduction of the Catholic Rheims or Douay translation, made some years before the King James version. The reader will understand this better if he refers to a work published recently at Oxford and discussed in this number of our magazine: *The Part of Rheims in the making of the English* (*Protestant*) *Bible*, by Dr. Carleton. Hence, a Catholic scholar who feels scruples on literary grounds to use Dr. Challoner's revision, made a hundred years ago, and which while doctrinally more accurate is less melodious than the English version of King James, might without explanation go back to the old Rheims or Douay versions from which the King James translators took most of the good style which they kept in their "reformed" revision.

Mr. Magnus MacLeal's *The Literature of the Celts, its History and Romance*, is announced by Blackie and Son (London) as a good reference work for students of Celtic literature.

One of our most versatile writers, Dr. James J. Walsh, undertakes to vindicate Professor Richard Garnett's view of the much maligned Pope Alexander VI, the justice of which has been questioned by Mr. William Roscoe Thayer. Garnett is keeper of the British Museum and has means of information which ordinarily balance the judgments of historians. We understand that the Appletons have arranged to accept Dr. Walsh's unprejudiced version of this subject for the new edition of their Encyclopædia.

The first number of the *Review of Catholic Pedagogy*, edited by the Rev. Thomas E. Judge, promises well. The articles are excellent, though the programme must necessarily be tentative. We shall follow its development with interest and keep our readers informed regarding important utterances which may make for a unification of our educational interests.

Speaking of Frederick Harrison's volume on *John Ruskin*, supposed to be the best of the books thus far issued in the "English Men of Letters" series (Macmillan), a keen critic in *The Expository Times* writes: "There is one curious and particular weakness in the book. It is this: Mr. Harrison writes, not as a man of letters, but as a man of a certain religious persuasion. He gives us to understand that there are just two classes of religious people in the world, Positivists and Calvinists. He himself and August Comte and John Ruskin (as it turns out) and a few others are Positivists; all the rest of the world are Calvinists." And, as Mr. Harrison would have it, "it is a dreadful thing to be a Calvinist, though there are degrees of dreadfulness in it. One of the worst kinds is a Bible Calvinist. John Ruskin's mother was that." To find Mr. Harrison claiming Ruskin as a Positivist almost touches the grotesque. But we find Ruskin expressing his religious conviction rather summarily in a passage in *Præterita:* "I grew daily more sure . . that the only constant form of pure religion is useful work, faithful love, and stintless charity." That of course is the essence of what religion requires from man; but it is not yet religion, if it lack the spirit of conformity to the appointed law or method of the Creator and Judge who endowed man with capacity for useful work, faithful love, and stintless charity, for a definite purpose. The recognition of this principle marks the difference between the "Religion of Humanity" and the Religion of Christ.

The current number of the *Cæcilia* publishes as musical supplement *Vesperae in Festo Sanctae Familiae Jesu, Mariae et Joseph*, by Professor Singenberger. The music is arranged for choral service and suits admirably not only for the feast of the Holy Family but also for other festive days at the afternoon service, where the Canonical Hours are not officially enjoined.

It is well known that writers on spiritual subjects often do their best work when under stress of illness. A comfortable bodily condition, whilst it heightens the animal spirits to a certain degree prompting facile expression—and thus facilitating certain kinds of artistic activity—does not allow the finer or nobler traits of the soul to operate. This operation requires a sort of refinement; and refinement is allied to a chastening self-restraint which creates the temper of sacrifice and superiority to selfish or earthly motives. Work produced under such conditions bears the semblance of its

origin. We detect it in the ring of the very sentences, even as the purity of silver speaks from the sound as it falls. Some of Father Faber's writing which he did with head swathed in bandages and under racking pains, or of Henry Perreyve, consumed with fever and pain in the chest, are examples.

But it happens also that writers on secular and imaginative topics find sickness a good driver of the higher powers. In this case the concentration upon literary or artistic work serves as a relief from pain. It is not the "when-I-am-weak-then-am-I-strong" of St. Paul, but rather the spontaneity of mind made operative by the will which dominates the inconveniences of the body. A very recent case of such activity told in Harper's Literary Gossip is that of Elinor Glyn, the author of *The Visits of Elizabeth* and quite lately of *Reflections of Ambrosine*. She tells how she came to write, without any idea of publishing: "I was ill with rheumatism and felt sad not being able to walk, so wrote to divert myself, taking my ideas from old journals of mine that my mother had kept, which I used to write for her when visiting about when I was a girl."

The Harpers are to bring out a new edition of Jacob Abbott's *Gentle Measures in the Management and Training of the Young*, which gives valuable suggestions as to the proper use of discipline in school and home.

A third edition of *The Harmony of the Religious Life* will soon be issued, with some slight changes and additions.

The press is at last doing justice to the young King of Spain, whom the revolutionary newspaper agents succeeded in maligning but a short time ago. It now appears by the best testimony that Alphonso is one of the most accomplished youths, both in qualities of mind and heart and in the external graces, that has ever honored a throne, or, we might say, even a noble home. We had some time ago a most attractive account from the domestic physician of the royal household (N. Y. *Independent*); and now there appears in *Harper's Bazaar* an account of his training, by Luis de Figuerola Ferretti, Chamberlain of the Royal Palace. Both authorities agree in picturing the royal youth as one of the most attractive figures in the domestic history of our age. Much of the grace and sweetness of his temper is due to the education given him by a mother who is queen not only in rank, but in character and heart as well. She has trained him personally as only a mother could who sees in her child not merely an object of affection, but who from the first moment of his existence understood the great responsibility which awaited him, should he become king. She knew that only in a complete realization of these responsibilities and a mastery of them could the boy find his future happiness, and so she kept the model ever before her and him. It is a splendid object-lesson for Christian mothers of to-day.

It has been suggested that the publication of a series of analytic studies of the more serious among the living Catholic writers in English would be a most desirable boon for the general reader of high-class literature. Not only would such an analysis lead to a correct appreciation of the works which have made an impression on the educated public at large, but it would serve also as a guide to teachers and instructors

n English literature who are expected to discriminate in the choice of the books they put into the hands of their pupils, and who are naturally desirous to recommend Catholic authors, if their style and thought should commend themselves as being on a level with the best in modern classics generally. Among the authors who have made a name by their writings that ranks them among the literary élite of our day are Dr. Barry, Bishop Spalding, Francis Thompson, Father Sheehan, Mrs. Meynell, Miss Guiney, Miss Repplier, and a few others, all of whom excel not so much by the voluminousness of their contributions to current literature as rather by the choice quality which has been recognized as separating them from the common run of popular writers.

A reviewer in the literary column of *The Independent*, commenting upon Mr. Mark Baldwin's recent volume entitled *Development and Evolution*, pertinently remarks that there can be no fruitful discussion of "evolution" without keeping separate and distinct the different meanings to which the terms explaining or describing it lend themselves. With "laws" enough, and "principles" enough, and a plentiful supply of phrases such as "social heredity with transmission," "intergenetic concurrence," "genetically and phylogenetically," "physicogenetic, neurogenetic and psychogenetic," it is easy to exhibit any set of facts as illustrations of natural selections, or "evolution by orthoplasy," or any other "principle." The "principle" becomes as plastic as the number of the beast, and is used with something of the same logic. We thoroughly agree with the critic. What we need in the exposition of practical science, especially when it is applied as a test of moral and religious principle, is clear definitions. Therein lies the superior merit of the scholastic method in its fundamentals. It uses terms with a distinct, intelligible, and exclusive meaning, so that once that meaning is properly apprehended, argument becomes logical and conclusions are drawn which are perfectly safe, if made in order, which is the purpose of the much abused syllogistic form.

Books Received.

THEOLOGICAL AND DEVOTIONAL.

SIXTEEN REVELATIONS OF DIVINE LOVE shewed to Mother Juliana of Norwich, 1373. With Preface by George Tyrrell, S.J. London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner & Co. 1902. Pp. 231. Price, $1.00.

VETERA ET NOVA (Old and New). By Rev. N. Walsh, S.J. Dublin: M. H. Gill & Son. (New York, Cincinnati and Chicago: Benziger Brothers.) Pp. 368. Price, $2.00.

THE FAILURE OF RITUALISM. Being a Letter to an Episcopalian, showing that Ritualism is Protestantism; also Editorial Observations. By B. F. De Costa. New York: Christian Press Association Publishing Company. 1902. Pp. 30.

INSTRUCTIO PASTORALIS Raymundi Antonii Episcopi. Jussu et auctoritate Rmi D. Francisci Leopoldi, Episcopi Eystettensis, iterum aucta et emendata. Editio Quinta. Friburgi Brisg.: Sumptibus Herder. 1902. St. Louis, Mo.: B. Herder. Pp. 620. Pretium, $2.85.

THE EUCHARISTIC MONTH, or Thirty-one Days' Preparation and Thanksgiving for the Holy Communion. Useful to Priests and all who communicate often. Translated and Revised by a Catholic Clergyman. To which is added: Devout Entertainments on the Holy Sacrament of the Altar; also the Encyclical of Pope Leo XIII on the Most Holy Eucharist. New York: P. J. Kenedy. 1903. Pp. 267.

THE SHROUD OF CHRIST. By Paul Vignon, D.Sc. (Fr.). Translated from the French. With nine Photogravure and Collotype Plates and thirty-eight Illustrations in the Text. New York: E. P. Dutton & Co. 1902. Pp. 170. Price, $4.00.

CHRISTUS- UND APOSTEL-BILDER. Einfluss der Apokryphen auf die ältesten Kunsttypen. Von J. E. Weis-Liebersdorf, Dr. Phil. et Theol. Mit 54 Abbildungen. Freiburg im Breisg., St. Louis, Mo.: B. Herder. 1902. Gr. 8vo. Pp. 124. Preis, $1.50.

ÆLTESTE LATEINISCHE UEBERSETZUNG DES BUCHES BARUCH. Zum ersten Male herausgegeben von Dr. Gottfried Hoberg, Prof. Universität Freiburg. Zweite Ausgabe. Freiburg im Breisg., St. Louis, Mo: B. Herder, 1902. Pp. 91. Preis, $1.25.

AN APOLOGY FOR THE RELIGIOUS ORDERS. By Saint Thomas Aquinas. Being a translation from the Latin of two of the minor works of the Saint. Edited with introduction by the Very Rev. Father John Procter, S.T.M., Ex-Provincial of the English Dominicans. St. Louis, Mo: B. Herder. 1902. Pp. 488. *This work was reviewed in our January number (English Edition).*

DE DEO-HOMINE (Tractatus), sive De Verbo Incarnato. Auctore Laurentio Janssens, S.T.D. 2 Pars: Mariologia—Soteriologia. Ex Summa Theologica ad modum Commentarii Aquinatis Summam praesentis aevi studiis aptatam. Tomus V totius operis. Friburgi Brisg.: Sumptibus Herder. 1902. Pp. 1021. St. Louis, Mo.: B. Herder. Price, $4.25.

ORDO DIVINI OFFICII RECITANDI Sacrique peragendi in usum Cleri Dioecesis Indianapolitanae. Ex Apostolica Concessione juxta Kalendarium Cleri Romani Proprium dispositus. Pro Anno Dom. Communi MCMIII. Indianapoli: Typis Corman et Harrington. 1902.

HISTORY AND BIOGRAPHY.

LES GALLA: Grande Nation Africaine (dits d'origine Gauloise). Un peuple antique au Pays de Ménélik. Par P. Martial de Salviac, Missionnaire O. M. Cap. Deuxième Édition. Ouvrage couronné par l'Academie Française. Paris: H. Oudin, Éditeur. Pp. 355. Ord. 8vo. Illustrated. Price, 7 frs. 50 cts.

THE LIFE OF JOHN WALTER WALSHE, F.S.A. Edited, with an introduction, by Montgomery Carmichael, Author of "In Tuscany," etc. New York: E. P. Dutton & Co. 1902. Pp. 266. Price, $2.00. (*The English edition of this volume was reviewed in the September number of this magazine.*)

THE GATHERING OF BROTHER HILARIUS. By Michael Fairless. New York: E. P. Dutton & Co. 1901. Pp. 171.

REV. MOTHER M. XAVIER WARDE, Foundress of the Order of Mercy in the United States. The Story of her Life, with brief Sketches of her Foundations. By the Sisters of Mercy, Mt. St. Mary's, Manchester, N. H. Preface by the Rt. Rev. Denis M. Bradley, D.D. Boston: Marlier & Co., Limited. 1902. Pp. 287. Price, $1.25.

LIFE OF SAINT PHILIP NERI, Apostle of Rome, and Founder of the Congregation of the Oratory. From the Italian by Father Bacci of the Roman Oratory. New and revised edition. By Frederick Ignatius Antrobus, of the London Oratory. St. Louis, Mo.: B. Herder. Vol. I, pp. 392; Vol. II, pp. 445. Price, $3.75 *net.*